arXiv:1404.5493v3 [math.FA] 17 Mar 2015

UNCONDITIONALITY OF ORTHOGONAL SPLINE SYSTEMS IN H^1

GEGHAM GEVORKYAN, ANNA KAMONT, KAREN KERYAN,
AND MARKUS PASSENBRUNNER

Abstract. We give a simple geometric characterization of knot sequences for which the corresponding orthonormal spline system of arbitrary order k is an unconditional basis in the atomic Hardy space $H^1[0,1]$.

1. Introduction.

This paper belongs to a series of papers studying properties of orthonormal spline systems with arbitrary knots. The detailed study of such systems started in 1960's with Z. Ciesielski's papers [2, 3] on properties of the Franklin system, which is an orthonormal system consisting of continuous piecewise linear functions with dyadic knots. Next, the results by J. Domsta (1972), cf. [11], made it possible to extend such study to orthonormal spline systems of higher order – and higher smoothness – with dyadic knots. These systems occurred to be bases or unconditional bases in several function spaces like $L^p[0,1]$, $1 \le p < \infty$, $C[0,1]$, $H^p[0,1]$, $0 < p \le 1$, Sobolev spaces $W^{p,k}[0,1]$, they give characterizations of BMO and VMO spaces, and various spaces of smooth functions (Hölder functions, Zygmund class, Besov spaces). One should mention here names such as Z. Ciesielski, J. Domsta, S.V. Bochkarev, P. Wojtaszczyk, S.-Y. A. Chang, P. Sjölin, J.-O. Strömberg (for more detailed references see e.g. [13], [15], [16]). Nowadays, results of this kind are known for wavelets.

The extension of these results to orthonormal spline systems with arbitrary knots has begun with the case of piecewise linear systems, i.e. general Franklin systems, or orthonormal spline systems of order 2. This was possible due to precise estimates of the inverse to the Gram matrix of piecewise linear B-spline bases with arbitrary knots, as presented in [19]. First results in this direction were obtained in [5] and [13]. We would like to mention here two results by G.G. Gevorkyan and A. Kamont. First, each general Franklin system is an unconditional basis in $L^p[0,1]$ for $1 < p < \infty$, cf. [14]. Second, there is a simple geometric characterization of knot sequences for which the corresponding general Franklin system is a basis or an unconditional basis in $H^1[0,1]$, cf. [15]. We note that in both of these results, an essential tool for their proof is the association of a so called characteristic interval to each general Franklin function f_n.

Date: March 18, 2015.

The case of splines of higher order is much more difficult. Let us mention that the basic result – the existence of a uniform bound for L^∞-norms of orthogonal projections on spline spaces of order k with arbitrary order (i.e. a bound depending on the order k, but independent of the sequence of knots) – was a long-standing problem known as C. de Boor's conjecture (1973), cf. [8]. The case of $k = 2$ was settled even earlier by Z. Ciesielski [2], the cases $k = 3, 4$ were solved by C. de Boor himself (1968, 1981), cf. [7, 9], but the positive answer in the general case was given by A. Yu. Shadrin [22] in 2001. A much simplified and shorter proof of this theorem was recently obtained by M. v. Golitschek (2014), cf. [24]. An immediate consequence of A.Yu. Shadrin's result is that if a sequence of knots is dense in $[0, 1]$, then the corresponding orthonormal spline system of order k is a basis in $L^p[0, 1]$, $1 \le p < \infty$ and $C[0, 1]$. Moreover, Z. Ciesielski [4] obtained several consequences of Shadrin's result, one of them being some estimate for the inverse to the B-spline Gram matrix. Using this estimate, G.G. Gevorkyan and A. Kamont [16] extended a part of their result from [15] to orthonormal spline systems of arbitrary order and obtained a characterization of knot sequences for which the corresponding orthonormal spline system of order k is a basis in $H^1[0, 1]$. Further extension required more precise estimates for the inverse of B-spline Gram matrices, of the type known for the piecewise linear case. Such estimates were obtained recently by M. Passenbrunner and A.Yu. Shadrin [21]. Using these estimates, M. Passenbrunner [20] proved that for each sequence of knots, the corresponding orthonormal spline system of order k is an unconditional basis in $L^p[0, 1]$, $1 < p < \infty$. The main result of the present paper is to give a characterization of those knot sequences for which the corresponding orthonormal spline system of order k is an unconditional basis in $H^1[0, 1]$.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we give necessary definitions and we formulate the main result of this paper – Theorem 2.4. In Sections 3 and 4 we recall or prove several facts needed for our results. In particular, in Section 4 we recall precise pointwise estimates for orthonormal spline systems with arbitrary knots, the associated characteristic intervals and some combinatoric facts for characteristic intervals. Then Section 5 contains some auxiliary results, and the proof of Theorem 2.4 is done in Section 6.

The results contained in this paper were obtained independently by the two teams G. Gevorkyan, K. Keryan and A. Kamont, M. Passenbrunner at the same time, so we have decided to work out a joint paper.

2. Definitions and the main result.

Let $k \ge 2$ be an integer. In this work, we are concerned with orthonormal spline systems of order k with arbitrary partitions. We let $\mathcal{T} = (t_n)_{n=2}^{\infty}$ be a dense sequence of points in the open unit interval such that each point occurs at most k times. Moreover, define $t_0 := 0$ and $t_1 := 1$. Such point sequences are called *k-admissible*. For n in the range $-k + 2 \le n \le 1$, let $\mathcal{S}_n^{(k)}$ be the space of polynomials of order $n+k-1$ (or degree $n+k-2$) on the

interval $[0,1]$ and $(f_n^{(k)})_{n=-k+2}^{1}$ be the collection of orthonormal polynomials in $L^2 \equiv L^2[0,1]$ such that the degree of $f_n^{(k)}$ is $n+k-2$. For $n \geq 2$, let $\mathcal{T}_n$ be the ordered sequence of points consisting of the grid points $(t_j)_{j=0}^n$ counting multiplicities and where the knots 0 and 1 have multiplicity k, i.e., $\mathcal{T}_n$ is of the form

$$\mathcal{T}_n = (0 = \tau_{n,1} = \cdots = \tau_{n,k} < \tau_{n,k+1} \leq \\ \leq \cdots \leq \tau_{n,n+k-1} < \tau_{n,n+k} = \cdots = \tau_{n,n+2k-1} = 1).$$

In that case, we also define $\mathcal{S}_n^{(k)}$ to be the space of polynomial splines of order k with grid points $\mathcal{T}_n$. For each $n \geq 2$, the space $\mathcal{S}_{n-1}^{(k)}$ has codimension 1 in $\mathcal{S}_n^{(k)}$ and, therefore, there exists a function $f_n^{(k)} \in \mathcal{S}_n^{(k)}$ that is orthonormal to the space $\mathcal{S}_{n-1}^{(k)}$. Observe that this function $f_n^{(k)}$ is unique up to sign.

Definition 2.1. The system of functions $(f_n^{(k)})_{n=-k+2}^{\infty}$ is called *orthonormal spline system of order k corresponding to the sequence* $(t_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$.

We will frequently omit the parameter k and write f_n and $\mathcal{S}_n$ instead of $f_n^{(k)}$ and $\mathcal{S}_n^{(k)}$, respectively.

Let us note that the case $k = 2$ corresponds to orthonormal systems of piecewise linear functions, i.e. general Franklin systems.

We are interested in characterizing sequences of knots $\mathcal{T}$ such that the system $(f_n^{(k)})_{n=-k+2}^{\infty}$ is an unconditional basis in $H^1 = H^1[0,1]$. By $H^1 = H^1[0,1]$ we mean the atomic Hardy space on $[0,1]$, cf [6]. A function $a : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ is called an *atom*, if either $a \equiv 1$ or there exists an interval Γ such that the following conditions are satisfied:

(i) $\operatorname{supp} a \subset \Gamma$,
(ii) $\|a\|_\infty \leq |\Gamma|^{-1}$,
(iii) $\int_0^1 a(x)\,\mathrm{d}x = \int_\Gamma a(x)\,\mathrm{d}x = 0$.

Then, by definition, H^1 consists of all functions f that have the representation

$$f = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_n a_n$$

for some atoms $(a_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ and real scalars $(c_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ such that $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |c_n| < \infty$. The space H^1 becomes a Banach space under the norm

$$\|f\|_{H^1} := \inf \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |c_n|,$$

where inf is taken over all atomic representations $\sum c_n a_n$ of f.

To formulate our result, we need to introduce some regularity conditions for a sequence $\mathcal{T}$.

For $n \geq 2$, $\ell \leq k$ and i in the range $k - \ell + 1 \leq i \leq n + k - 1$, we define $D_{n,i}^{(\ell)}$ to be the interval $[\tau_{n,i}, \tau_{n,i+\ell}]$.

Definition 2.2. Let $\ell \leq k$ and $(t_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$ be an ℓ-admissible (and therefore k-admissible) point sequence. Then, this sequence is called *ℓ-regular with*

parameter $\gamma \geq 1$ if

$$\frac{|D_{n,i}^{(\ell)}|}{\gamma} \leq |D_{n,i+1}^{(\ell)}| \leq \gamma |D_{n,i}^{(\ell)}|, \qquad n \geq 2,\ k-\ell+1 \leq i \leq n+k-2.$$

So, in other words, (t_n) is ℓ-regular, if there is a uniform finite bound $\gamma \geq 1$, such that for all n, the ratios of the lengths of neighboring supports of B-spline functions (cf. Section 3.2) of order ℓ in the grid $\mathcal{T}_n$ are bounded by γ.

The following characterization for $(f_n^{(k)})$ to be a basis in H^1 is the main result of [16]:

Theorem 2.3 ([16])**.** *Let $k \geq 1$ and let (t_n) be a k-admissible sequence of knots in $[0,1]$ with the corresponding orthonormal spline system $(f_n^{(k)})$ of order k. Then, $(f_n^{(k)})$ is a basis in H^1 if and only if (t_n) is k-regular with some parameter $\gamma \geq 1$*

In this paper, we prove the characterization for $(f_n^{(k)})$ to be an unconditional basis in H^1. The main result of our paper is the following:

Theorem 2.4. *Let (t_n) be a k-admissible sequence of points. Then, the corresponding orthonormal spline system $(f_n^{(k)})$ is an unconditional basis in H^1 if and only if (t_n) satisfies the $(k-1)$-regularity condition with some parameter $\gamma \geq 1$.*

Let us note that in case $k = 2$, i.e. for general Franklin systems, both Theorems 2.3 and 2.4 were obtained by G. G. Gevorkyan and A. Kamont in [15]. (In the terminology of the current paper, the condition of strong regularity from [15] is now 1-regularity, and the condition of strong regularity for pairs from [15] is now 2-regularity.)

The proof of Theorem 2.4 follows the same general scheme as the proof of Theorem 2.2 in [15]. In Section 5 we introduce four conditions (A) – (D) for series with respect to orthonormal spline systems of order k corresponding to a k-admissible sequence of points. Then we study relations between these conditions under various regularity assumptions on the underlying sequence of points. Having done this, we proceed with the proof of Theorem 2.4 in Section 6.

3. Preliminaries

The parameter $k \geq 2$ will always be used for the order of the underlying polynomials or splines. We use the notation $A(t) \sim B(t)$ to indicate the existence of two constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$, such that $c_1 B(t) \leq A(t) \leq c_2 B(t)$ for all t, where t denotes all implicit and explicit dependencies that the expressions A and B might have. If the constants c_1, c_2 depend on an additional parameter p, we write this as $A(t) \sim_p B(t)$. Correspondingly, we use the symbols $\lesssim, \gtrsim, \lesssim_p, \gtrsim_p$. For a subset E of the real line, we denote by $|E|$ the Lebesgue measure of E and by $\mathbb{1}_E$ the characteristic function of E. If $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is a real valued function and λ is a real parameter, we write the level set of all points at which f is greater than λ as $[f > \lambda] := \{\omega \in \Omega : f(\omega) > \lambda\}$.

3.1. **Properties of regular sequences of points.** The following Lemma describes geometric decay of intervals in regular sequences (recall the notation $D_{n,i}^{(\ell)} = [\tau_{n,i}, \tau_{n,i+\ell}]$):

Lemma 3.1. *Let (t_n) be a k-admissible sequence of points that satisfies the ℓ-regularity condition for some $1 \le \ell \le k$ with parameter γ and let $D_{n_1,i_1}^{(\ell)} \supset \cdots \supset D_{n_{2\ell},i_{2\ell}}^{(\ell)}$ be a strictly decreasing sequence of sets defined above. Then,*

$$|D_{n_{2\ell},i_{2\ell}}^{(\ell)}| \le \frac{\gamma^\ell}{1+\gamma^\ell} |D_{n_1,i_1}^{(\ell)}|.$$

Proof. We set $V_j := D_{n_j,i_j}^{(\ell)}$ for $1 \le j \le 2\ell$. Then, by definition, V_1 contains $\ell+1$ grid points from $\mathcal{T}_{n_1}$ and it contains at least 3ℓ grid points of the grid $\mathcal{T}_{n_{2\ell}}$. As a consequence, there exists an interval $D_{n_{2\ell},m}^{(\ell)}$ for some index m that satisfies

$$\operatorname{int}(D_{n_{2\ell},m}^{(\ell)} \cap V_{2\ell}) = \emptyset, \qquad D_{n_{2\ell},m}^{(\ell)} \subset V_1, \qquad \operatorname{dist}(D_{n_{2\ell},m}^{(\ell)}, V_{2\ell}) = 0.$$

The ℓ-regularity of (t_n) now implies

$$|V_{2\ell}| \le \gamma^\ell |D_{n_{2\ell},m}^{(\ell)}| \le \gamma^\ell \big(|V_1| - |V_{2\ell}|\big),$$

i.e., $|V_{2\ell}| \le \frac{\gamma^\ell}{1+\gamma^\ell} |V_1|$, which proves the assertion of the lemma. □

3.2. **Properties of B-spline functions.** We define the functions $(N_{n,i}^{(k)})_{i=1}^{n+k-1}$ to be the collection of B-spline functions of order k corresponding to the partition $\mathcal{T}_n$. Those functions are normalized in such a way that they form a partition of unity, i.e., $\sum_{i=1}^{n+k-1} N_{n,i}^{(k)}(x) = 1$ for all $x \in [0,1]$. Associated to this basis, there exists a biorthogonal basis of $\mathcal{S}_n$, which is denoted by $(N_{n,i}^{(k)*})_{i=1}^{n+k-1}$. If the setting of the parameters k and n is clear from the context, we also denote those functions by $(N_i)_{i=1}^{n+k-1}$ and $(N_i^*)_{i=1}^{n+k-1}$, respectively.

We will need the following well known formula for the derivative of a linear combination of B-spline functions: if $g = \sum_{j=1}^{n+k-1} a_j N_{n,j}^{(k)}$, then

$$g' = (k-1) \sum_{j=2}^{n+k-1} (a_j - a_{j-1}) \frac{N_{n,j}^{(k-1)}}{|D_{n,j}^{(k-1)}|}. \tag{3.1}$$

We now recall an elementary property of polynomials.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $0 < \rho < 1$. Let I be an interval and $A \subset I$ be a subset of I with $|A| \ge \rho |I|$. Then, for every polynomial Q of order k on I,*

$$\max_{t \in I} |Q(t)| \lesssim_{\rho,k} \sup_{t \in A} |Q(t)| \qquad \text{and} \qquad \int_I |Q(t)|\,\mathrm{d}t \lesssim_{\rho,k} \int_A |Q(t)|\,\mathrm{d}t.$$

We continue with recalling a few important results for B-splines (N_i) and their dual functions (N_i^*).

Proposition 3.3. *Let $1 \le p \le \infty$ and $g = \sum_{j=1}^{n+k-1} a_j N_j$, where the collection $(N_i)_{i=1}^{n+k-1}$ are the B-splines of order k corresponding to the partition $\mathcal{T}_n$. Then,*

$$|a_j| \lesssim_k |J_j|^{-1/p} \|g\|_{L^p(J_j)}, \qquad 1 \le j \le n+k-1, \tag{3.2}$$

where J_j is a subinterval $[\tau_{n,i}, \tau_{n,i+1}]$ of $[\tau_{n,j}, \tau_{n,j+k}]$ of maximal length. Additionally,

$$\|g\|_p \sim_k \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n+k-1} |a_j|^p |D_{n,j}^{(k)}| \Big)^{1/p} = \|(a_j |D_{n,j}^{(k)}|^{1/p})_{j=1}^{n+k-1}\|_{\ell^p}. \tag{3.3}$$

Moreover, if $h = \sum_{j=1}^{n+k-1} b_j N_j^*$,

$$\|h\|_p \lesssim_k \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{n+k-1} |b_j|^p |D_{n,j}^{(k)}|^{1-p} \Big)^{1/p} = \|(b_j |D_{n,j}^{(k)}|^{1/p-1})_{j=1}^{n+k-1}\|_{\ell^p}. \tag{3.4}$$

The two inequalites (3.2) and (3.3) are Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.2 in [10, Chapter 5], respectively. Inequality (3.4) is a consequence of Shadrin's theorem [22], that the orthogonal projection operator onto $\mathcal{S}_n^{(k)}$ is bounded on L^∞ independently of n and $\mathcal{T}_n$. For a deduction of (3.4) from this result, see [4, Property P.7].

The next thing to consider are estimates for the inverse $(b_{ij})_{i,j=1}^{n+k-1}$ of the Gram matrix $(\langle N_i, N_j \rangle)_{i,j=1}^{n+k-1}$. Later, we will need one special property of this matrix, which is that $(b_{ij})_{i,j=1}^{n+k-1}$ is checkerboard, i.e.,

$$(-1)^{i+j} b_{ij} \ge 0 \quad \text{for all } i, j. \tag{3.5}$$

This is a simple consequence of the total positivity of the Gram matrix $(\langle N_i, N_j \rangle)_{i,j=1}^{n+k-1}$, cf. [7, 18]. Moreover, we need the following lower estimate for $b_{i,i}$:

$$|D_{n,i}^{(k)}|^{-1} \lesssim_k b_{i,i}. \tag{3.6}$$

This estimate is a consequence of the total positivity of the B-spline Gram matrix, the L^2-stability of B-splines and the following Lemma 3.4

Lemma 3.4 ([20])**.** *Let $C = (c_{ij})_{i,j=1}^n$ be a symmetric positive definite matrix. Then, for $(d_{ij})_{i,j=1}^n = C^{-1}$ we have*

$$c_{ii}^{-1} \le d_{ii}, \qquad 1 \le i \le n.$$

3.3. **Some results for orthonormal spline systems.** We recall now two results concerning orthonormal spline series, which we will need in the sequel.

Theorem 3.5 ([21])**.** *Let $(f_n)_{n=-k+2}^\infty$ be the orthonormal spline system of order k corresponding to an arbitrary k-admissible point sequence $(t_n)_{n=0}^\infty$. Then, for an arbitrary $f \in L^1 \equiv L^1[0,1]$, the series $\sum_{n=-k+2}^\infty \langle f, f_n \rangle f_n$ converges to f almost everywhere.*

Let $f \in L^p \equiv L^p[0,1]$ for some $1 \le p < \infty$. Since the orthonormal spline system $(f_n)_{n \ge -k+2}$ is a basis in L^p, we can write $f = \sum_{n=-k+2}^{\infty} a_n f_n$. Based on this expansion, we define the *square function* $Pf := \big(\sum_{n=-k+2}^{\infty} |a_n f_n|^2 \big)^{1/2}$ and the *maximal function* $Sf := \sup_m \big| \sum_{n \le m} a_n f_n \big|$. Moreover, given a measurable function g, we denote by $\mathcal{M}g$ the *Hardy-Littlewood maximal function* of g defined as

$$\mathcal{M}g(x) := \sup_{I \ni x} |I|^{-1} \int_I |g(t)| \, \mathrm{d}t,$$

where the supremum is taken over all intervals I containing the point x. The connection between the maximal function Sf and the Hardy-Littlewood maximal function is given by the following result:

Theorem 3.6 ([21]). *If $f \in L^1$, we have*

$$Sf(t) \lesssim_k \mathcal{M}f(t), \qquad t \in [0,1].$$

4. Properties of orthogonal spline functions and characteristic intervals

4.1. **Estimates for f_n.** This section treats the calculation and estimation of one explicit orthonormal spline function $f_n^{(k)}$ for fixed $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n \ge 2$ induced by the k-admissible sequence $(t_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$. Most of the presented results are taken from [20].

Here, we change our notation slightly. We fix the parameter n and let i_0 be an index with $k+1 \le i_0 \le n+k-1$ such that $\mathcal{T}_{n-1}$ equals $\mathcal{T}_n$ with the point τ_{i_0} removed. In the points of the partition $\mathcal{T}_n$, we omit the parameter n and $\mathcal{T}_n$ is thus given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{T}_n = (0 = \tau_1 = \cdots = \tau_k < \tau_{k+1} \le \cdots \le \tau_{i_0} \\ \le \cdots \le \tau_{n+k-1} < \tau_{n+k} = \cdots = \tau_{n+2k-1} = 1).\end{aligned}$$

We denote by $(N_i : 1 \le i \le n+k-1)$ the B-spline functions corresponding to $\mathcal{T}_n$.

An (unnormalized) orthogonal spline function $g \in \mathcal{S}_n^{(k)}$ that is orthogonal to $\mathcal{S}_{n-1}^{(k)}$, as calculated in [20], is given by

$$g = \sum_{j=i_0-k}^{i_0} \alpha_j N_j^* = \sum_{j=i_0-k}^{i_0} \sum_{\ell=1}^{n+k-1} \alpha_j b_{j\ell} N_\ell, \tag{4.1}$$

where $(b_{j\ell})_{j,\ell=1}^{n+k-1}$ is the inverse of the Gram matrix $(\langle N_j, N_\ell \rangle)_{j,\ell=1}^{n+k-1}$ and the sequence (α_j) is given by

$$\alpha_j = (-1)^{j-i_0+k} \Big(\prod_{\ell=i_0-k+1}^{j-1} \frac{\tau_{i_0} - \tau_\ell}{\tau_{\ell+k} - \tau_\ell} \Big) \Big(\prod_{\ell=j+1}^{i_0-1} \frac{\tau_{\ell+k} - \tau_{i_0}}{\tau_{\ell+k} - \tau_\ell} \Big), \quad i_0 - k \le j \le i_0. \tag{4.2}$$

We remark that the sequence (α_j) alternates in sign and since the matrix $(b_{j\ell})_{j,\ell=1}^{n+k-1}$ is checkerboard, we see that the B-spline coefficients of g, namely

$$w_\ell := \sum_{j=i_0-k}^{i_0} \alpha_j b_{j\ell}, \qquad 1 \le \ell \le n+k-1, \tag{4.3}$$

satisfy

$$\Big| \sum_{j=i_0-k}^{i_0} \alpha_j b_{j\ell} \Big| = \sum_{j=i_0-k}^{i_0} |\alpha_j b_{j\ell}|, \qquad 1 \le j \le n+k-1. \tag{4.4}$$

In the following Definition 4.1, we assign to each orthonormal spline function a characteristic interval that is a grid point interval $[\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]$ and lies in the proximity of the newly inserted point τ_{i_0}. The choice of this interval is crucial for proving important properties of the system $(f_n^{(k)})_{n=-k+2}^{\infty}$. This approach has its origins in [14], where it is proved that general Franklin systems are unconditional bases in L^p, $1 < p < \infty$.

Definition 4.1. Let $\mathcal{T}_n, \mathcal{T}_{n-1}$ be as above and τ_{i_0} be the new point in $\mathcal{T}_n$ that is not present in $\mathcal{T}_{n-1}$. We define the *characteristic interval* J_n *corresponding to the pair* $(\mathcal{T}_n, \mathcal{T}_{n-1})$ as follows.

(1) Let

$$\Lambda^{(0)} := \{i_0 - k \le j \le i_0 : |[\tau_j, \tau_{j+k}]| \le 2 \min_{i_0-k \le \ell \le i_0} |[\tau_\ell, \tau_{\ell+k}]|\}$$

be the set of all indices j for which the corresponding support of the B-spline function N_j is approximately minimal. Observe that $\Lambda^{(0)}$ is nonempty.

(2) Define

$$\Lambda^{(1)} := \{j \in \Lambda^{(0)} : |\alpha_j| = \max_{\ell \in \Lambda^{(0)}} |\alpha_\ell|\}.$$

For an arbitrary, but fixed index $j^{(0)} \in \Lambda^{(1)}$, set $J^{(0)} := [\tau_{j^{(0)}}, \tau_{j^{(0)}+k}]$.

(3) The interval $J^{(0)}$ can now be written as the union of k grid intervals

$$J^{(0)} = \bigcup_{\ell=0}^{k-1} [\tau_{j^{(0)}+\ell}, \tau_{j^{(0)}+\ell+1}] \qquad \text{with } j^{(0)} \text{ as above.}$$

We define the *characteristic interval* J_n to be one of the above k intervals that has maximal length.

A few clarifying comments to this definitions are in order. Roughly speaking, we first take the B-spline support $[\tau_j, \tau_{j+k}]$ intersecting the new point τ_{i_0} with minimal length and then we choose as J_n the largest grid point interval in $[\tau_j, \tau_{j+k}]$. This definition guarantees the concentration of f_n at J_n in terms of the L^p-norm (cf. Lemma 4.3) and the exponential decay of f_n away from J_n (cf. Lemma 4.4), which are crucial for further investigations. An important ingredient in the proof of Lemma 4.3 is Proposition 3.3, being the reason why we choose the largest grid point interval as J_n. Further important properties of the collection (J_n) of characteristic intervals are

that they form a nested family of sets and for a subsequence of decreasing characteristic intervals, their lengths decay geometrically (cf. Lemma 4.5).

Next we remark that the constant 2 in step (1) of Definition 4.1 could also be an arbitrary number $C > 1$, but $C = 1$ is not allowed. This is in contrast to the definition of characteristic intervals in [14] for piecewise linear orthogonal functions ($k = 2$), where precisely $C = 1$ is chosen, step (2) of Definition 4.1 is omitted and $j^{(0)}$ is an arbitrary index in the set $\Lambda^{(0)}$.

At first glance, it might seem natural to carry over the same definition to arbitrary spline orders k, but at some point in the proof of Theorem 4.2, we estimate $\alpha_{j^{(0)}}$ by the constant $(C-1)$ from below, which has to be strictly greater than zero in order to establish (4.5). Since Theorem 4.2 is also used in the proofs of both Lemma 4.3 and Lemma 4.4, this is the reason for a different definition of characteristic intervals here than in [14], in particular for step (2) of Definition 4.1.

Theorem 4.2 ([20])**.** *With the above definition* (4.3) *of* w_ℓ *for* $1 \le \ell \le n+k-1$ *and the index* $j^{(0)}$ *given in Definition 4.1,*

$$|w_{j^{(0)}}| \gtrsim_k b_{j^{(0)},j^{(0)}}. \tag{4.5}$$

Lemma 4.3 ([20])**.** *Let* $\mathcal{T}_n$, $\mathcal{T}_{n-1}$ *be as above and* g *be the function given in* (4.1)*. Then,* $f_n = g/\|g\|_2$ *is the* L^2*-normalized orthogonal spline function corresponding to* $(\mathcal{T}_n, \mathcal{T}_{n-1})$ *and*

$$\|f_n\|_{L^p(J_n)} \sim_k \|f_n\|_p \sim_k |J_n|^{1/p-1/2} \sim_k |J_n|^{1/2}\|g\|_p, \qquad 1 \le p \le \infty,$$

where J_n *is the characteristic interval associated to* $(\mathcal{T}_n, \mathcal{T}_{n-1})$*.*

By $d_n(x)$ we denote the number of points in $\mathcal{T}_n$ between x and J_n counting endpoints of J_n. Correspondingly, for an interval $V \subset [0,1]$, by $d_n(V)$ we denote the number of points in $\mathcal{T}_n$ between V and J_n counting endpoints of both J_n and V.

Lemma 4.4 ([20])**.** *Let* $\mathcal{T}_n, \mathcal{T}_{n-1}$ *be as above,* $g = \sum_{j=1}^{n+k-1} w_j N_j$ *be the function in* (4.1) *with* $(w_j)_{j=1}^{n+k-1}$ *as in* (4.3) *and* $f_n = g/\|g\|_2$*. Then, there exists a constant* $0 < q < 1$ *that depends only on* k *such that.*

$$|w_j| \lesssim_k \frac{q^{d_n(\tau_j)}}{|J_n| + \operatorname{dist}(\operatorname{supp} N_j, J_n) + |D^k_{n,j}|} \quad \text{for all } 1 \le j \le n+k-1. \tag{4.6}$$

Moreover, if $x < \inf J_n$*, we have*

$$\|f_n\|_{L^p(0,x)} \lesssim_k \frac{q^{d_n(x)}|J_n|^{1/2}}{(|J_n| + \operatorname{dist}(x, J_n))^{1-1/p}}, \qquad 1 \le p \le \infty. \tag{4.7}$$

Similarly, for $x > \sup J_n$*,*

$$\|f_n\|_{L^p(x,1)} \lesssim_k \frac{q^{d_n(x)}|J_n|^{1/2}}{(|J_n| + \operatorname{dist}(x, J_n))^{1-1/p}}, \qquad 1 \le p \le \infty. \tag{4.8}$$

4.2. **Combinatorics of characteristic intervals.** Next, we recall a combinatorial result about the relative positions of different characteristic intervals:

Lemma 4.5 ([20])**.** *Let $x, y \in (t_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$ such that $x < y$. Then there exists a constant F_k only depending on k such that*

$$N_0 := \operatorname{card}\{n : J_n \subseteq [x, y], |J_n| \geq |[x, y]|/2\} \leq F_k,$$

where $\operatorname{card} E$ *denotes the cardinality of the set E.*

Similarly to [14] and [15], we need the following estimate involving characteristic intervals and orthonormal spline functions:

Lemma 4.6. *Let (t_n) be a k-admissible point sequence in $[0, 1]$ and let $(f_n)_{n \geq -k+2}$ be the corresponding orthonormal spline system of order k. Then, for each interval $V = [\alpha, \beta] \subset [0, 1]$,*

$$\sum_{n : J_n \subset V} |J_n|^{1/2} \int_{V^c} |f_n(t)| \, \mathrm{d}t \lesssim_k |V|.$$

Once we know the estimates for orthonormal spline functions as in Lemma 4.4 and the basic combinatorial result for their characteristic intervals, i.e. Lemma 4.5, this result follows by the same line of arguments that was used in the proof of Lemma 4.6 in [14], so we skip its proof.

Instead of Lemma 3.4 of [15], we will use the following:

Lemma 4.7. *Let $(t_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$ be a k-admissible knot sequence that satisfies the $(k-1)$-regularity condition and let $\Delta = D_{m,i}^{(k-1)}$ for some indices m and i. For $\ell \geq 0$, let*

$$N(\Delta) := \{n : \ \operatorname{card}(\Delta \cap \mathcal{T}_n) = k, \ J_n \subset \Delta\},$$
$$M(\Delta, \ell) := \{n : d_n(\Delta) = \ell, \ \operatorname{card}(\Delta \cap \mathcal{T}_n) \geq k, \ |J_n \cap \Delta| = 0\},$$

where in both definitions we count the points in $\Delta \cap \mathcal{T}_n$ including multiplicities. Then,

(4.9)
$$\frac{1}{|\Delta|} \sum_{n \in N(\Delta)} |J_n| \lesssim_k 1 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \sum_{n \in M(\Delta, \ell)} \frac{|J_n|}{\operatorname{dist}(J_n, \Delta) + |\Delta|} \lesssim_{k, \gamma} (\ell + 1)^2.$$

Proof. For every $n \in N(\Delta)$, there are only the $k-1$ possibilities $D_{m,i}^{(1)}, \ldots, D_{m,i+k-2}^{(1)}$ for J_n and by Lemma 4.5, each interval $D_{m,j}^{(1)}$, $j = i, \ldots, i+k-2$ occurs at most F_k times as a characteristic interval. This implies the first inequality in (4.9).

We now prove the second inequality in (4.9). To begin with, assume that each J_n, $n \in M(\Delta, \ell)$ lies to the right of Δ, since the other case is covered by similar methods. The argument is split in two parts depending on the value of the parameter ℓ, beginning with $\ell \leq k$. In that case, for $n \in M(\Delta, \ell)$, let $J_n^{1/2}$ be the unique interval determined by the conditions

$$\sup J_n^{1/2} = \sup J_n, \qquad |J_n^{1/2}| = |J_n|/2.$$

Since $d_n(\Delta) = \ell$ is constant, we group the occurring intervals J_n into packets, where all intervals in one packet have the same left endpoint and maximal intervals from different packets are disjoint (up to possibly one point). By Lemma 4.5, each point $t \in [0,1]$ belongs to at most F_k intervals $J_n^{1/2}$. The $(k-1)$-regularity and the fact that $\ell \le k$ now imply $|J_n| \lesssim_{k,\gamma} |\Delta|$ and $\operatorname{dist}(\Delta, J_n) \lesssim_{k,\gamma} |\Delta|$ for $n \in M(\Delta,\ell)$ and thus, every interval J_n for $n \in M(\Delta,\ell)$ is a subset of a fixed interval whose length is comparable to $|\Delta|$. So, putting these things together,

$$\sum_{n\in M(\Delta,\ell)} \frac{|J_n|}{\operatorname{dist}(J_n,\Delta)+|\Delta|} \le \frac{1}{|\Delta|}\sum_{n\in M(\Delta,\ell)} |J_n| = \frac{2}{|\Delta|}\sum_{n\in M(\Delta,\ell)} \int_{J_n^{1/2}} \mathrm{d}x \lesssim_{k,\gamma} 1,$$

which completes the case of $\ell \le k$.

Next, assume $\ell \ge k+1$ and define $(L_j)_{j=1}^{\infty}$ as the strictly decreasing sequence of all sets L that satisfy

$$L = D_{n,i}^{(k-1)} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \sup L = \sup \Delta$$

for some index n and i. Moreover, set

$$M_j(\Delta,\ell) := \{n \in M(\Delta,\ell) : \operatorname{card}(L_j \cap \mathcal{T}_n) = k\},$$

i.e., L_j is a union of $k-1$ grid point intervals in the grid $\mathcal{T}_n$. Then, since $|\Delta| + \operatorname{dist}(J_n,\Delta) \gtrsim_{\gamma} |\Delta| + \operatorname{dist}(t,\Delta)$ for $t \in J_n^{1/2}$ by $(k-1)$-regularity,

$$\sum_{n\in M_j(\Delta,\ell)} \frac{|J_n|}{\operatorname{dist}(J_n,\Delta)+|\Delta|} \lesssim_{k,\gamma} \sum_{n\in M_j(\Delta,\ell)} \int_{J_n^{1/2}} \frac{1}{\operatorname{dist}(t,\Delta)+|\Delta|}\,\mathrm{d}t.$$

If $n \in M_j(\Delta,\ell)$ we get, again due to $(k-1)$-regularity,

$$\inf J_n^{1/2} \ge \inf J_n \ge \gamma^{-k}|L_j| + \sup \Delta,$$

and

$$\sup J_n^{1/2} \le \inf J_n + |J_n| \le C_k\gamma^{\ell}|L_j| + \sup \Delta$$

for some constant C_k only depending on k. Combining this with Lemma 4.5, which implies that each point t belongs to at most F_k intervals $J_n^{1/2}$,

$$\sum_{n\in M_j(\Delta,\ell)} \int_{J_n^{1/2}} \frac{1}{\operatorname{dist}(t,\Delta)+|\Delta|}\,\mathrm{d}t \lesssim \int_{\gamma^{-k}|L_j|+|\Delta|}^{C_k\gamma^{\ell}|L_j|+|\Delta|} \frac{1}{s}\,\mathrm{d}s. \tag{4.10}$$

Next we will show that the above intervals of integration can intersect at most for roughly ℓ indices j. Let $j_2 \ge j_1$, so that $L_{j_1} \supset L_{j_2}$ and write $j_2 = j_1 + 2kr + t$ with $t \le 2k-1$. Then, by Lemma 3.1,

$$C_k\gamma^{\ell}|L_{j_2}| \le C_k\gamma^{\ell}|L_{j_1+2kr}| \le C_k\gamma^{\ell}\eta^r|L_{j_1}|,$$

where $\eta = \gamma^{k-1}/(1+\gamma^{k-1}) < 1$. If now $r \ge C_{k,\gamma}\ell$ for some suitable constant $C_{k,\gamma}$ depending only on k and γ, we have

$$C_k\gamma^{\ell}|L_{j_2}| \le \gamma^{-k}|L_{j_1}|.$$

Thus, each point s in the integral in (4.10) for some j belongs to at most $C_{k,\gamma}\ell$ intervals $[\gamma^{-k}|L_j| + |\Delta|, C_k\gamma^{\ell}|L_j| + |\Delta|]$ where j is varying. So we conclude by summing over j

$$\sum_{n\in M(\Delta,\ell)} \frac{|J_n|}{\operatorname{dist}(J_n,\Delta)+|\Delta|} \le C_{k,\gamma}\ell \int_{|\Delta|}^{(1+C_k\gamma^{\ell})|\Delta|} \frac{1}{s}\,\mathrm{d}s \le C_{k,\gamma}\ell^2.$$

This completes the analysis of the case $\ell \ge k+1$ and thus, the proof of the lemma is finished. □

5. Four conditions on spline series and their relations

Let (t_n) be a k-admissible sequence of knots with the corresponding orthonormal spline system $(f_n)_{n\ge -k+2}$. For a sequence $(a_n)_{n\ge -k+2}$ of coefficients, let

$$P := \Big(\sum_{n=-k+2}^{\infty} a_n^2 f_n^2\Big)^{1/2} \qquad \text{and} \qquad S := \max_{m\ge -k+2}\Big|\sum_{n=-k+2}^{m} a_n f_n\Big|.$$

If $f \in L^1$, we denote by Pf and Sf the functions P and S corresponding to the coefficient sequence $a_n = \langle f, f_n\rangle$, respectively. Consider the following conditions:

(A) $P \in L^1$,
(B) The series $\sum_{n=-k+2}^{\infty} a_n f_n$ converges unconditionally in L^1,
(C) $S \in L^1$,
(D) There exists a function $f \in H^1$ such that $a_n = \langle f, f_n\rangle$.

We will discuss the relations between those four conditions and we will prove the implications indicated in the subsequent picture, where some results need certain regularity conditions imposed on the point sequence (t_n), which is also indicated in the image.



Let us recall that in case of orthonormal spline systems with dyadic knots, the relations (and equivalences) of these conditions have been studied by several authors, also in case $p < 1$, see e.g. [23, 1, 12]. For general Franklin systems corresponding to arbitrary sequences of knots, the relations of these

conditions were discussed in [15] (and earlier in [13], also for $p < 1$, but for a restricted class of point sequences). In the sequel, we follow the approach from [15] and we adapt it to the case of spline orthonormal systems of order k.

We begin with the implication (B) $\Rightarrow$ (A), which is a consequence of Khinchin's inequality:

Proposition 5.1 ((B) $\Rightarrow$ (A))**.** *Let (t_n) be a k-admissible sequence of knots with the corresponding general orthonormal spline system (f_n) and let (a_n) be a sequence of coefficients. If the series $\sum_{n=-k+2}^{\infty} a_n f_n$ converges unconditionally in L^1, then $P \in L^1$. Moreover,*

$$\|P\|_1 \lesssim \sup_{\varepsilon\in\{-1,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}} \Big\| \sum_{n=-k+2}^{\infty} \varepsilon_n a_n f_n \Big\|_1.$$

Next, we investigate the implications (A) $\Rightarrow$ (B) and (A) $\Rightarrow$ (C). Let us note that once we know the estimates and combinatorial results of Sections 3 and 4, the proof is the same as the proof of Proposition 4.3 in [15], so we just state the result.

Proposition 5.2 ((A) $\Rightarrow$ (B) and (A) $\Rightarrow$ (C))**.** *Let (t_n) be a k-admissible sequence of knots and let (a_n) be a sequence of coefficients such that $P \in L^1$. Then, $S \in L^1$ and $\sum a_n f_n$ converges unconditionally in L^1; moreover,*

$$\sup_{\varepsilon\in\{-1,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}} \Big\| \sum_{n=-k+2}^{\infty} \varepsilon_n a_n f_n \Big\| \lesssim_k \|P\|_1 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \|S\|_1 \lesssim_k \|P\|_1.$$

Next we discuss (D) $\Rightarrow$ (A).

Proposition 5.3 ((D) $\Rightarrow$ (A))**.** *Let (t_n) be a k-admissible point sequence that satisfies the $(k-1)$-regularity condition with parameter γ. Then there exists a constant $C_{k,\gamma}$ depending only on k and γ such that for each atom ϕ,*

$$\|P\phi\|_1 \le C_{k,\gamma}.$$

Consequently, if $f \in H^1$, then

$$\|Pf\|_1 \le C_{k,\gamma}\|f\|_{H^1}.$$

Before we proceed with the proof, let us remark that essentially the same arguments give a direct proof of (D) $\Rightarrow$ (C), under the same assumption of $(k-1)$-regularity of the sequence of points (t_n), and moreover

$$\|Sf\|_1 \le C_{k,\gamma}\|f\|_{H^1}.$$

We do not present it here, since we have the implications (D) $\Rightarrow$ (A) under the assumption of $(k-1)$-regularity and (A) $\Rightarrow$ (C) under the assumption of k-admissibility only. Note that Proposition 6.1 in Section 6 shows that – without the assumption of $(k-1)$-regularity of the point sequence – the implications (D) $\Rightarrow$ (A) and (D) $\Rightarrow$ (C) need not be true.

Proof of Proposition 5.3. Let ϕ be an atom with $\int_0^1 \phi(u)\,\mathrm{d}u = 0$ and let $\Gamma = [\alpha, \beta]$ be an interval such that $\operatorname{supp}\phi \subset \Gamma$ and $\sup|\phi| \leq |\Gamma|^{-1}$. Define $n_\Gamma := \max\{n : \operatorname{card}(\mathcal{T}_n \cap \Gamma) \leq k-1\}$, where in the maximum, we also count multiplicities of knots. It will be shown that

$$\|P_1\phi\|_1,\ \|P_2\phi\|_1 \lesssim_{\gamma,k} 1,$$

where

$$P_1\phi = \Big(\sum_{n\leq n_\Gamma} a_n^2 f_n^2\Big)^{1/2} \qquad \text{and} \qquad P_2\phi = \Big(\sum_{n>n_\Gamma} a_n^2 f_n^2\Big)^{1/2}.$$

First, we consider P_1 and prove the stronger inequality

$$\sum_{n\leq n_\Gamma} |a_n|\|f_n\|_1 \lesssim_{k,\gamma} 1,$$

where $a_n = \langle \phi, f_n\rangle$. For each parameter $n \leq n_\Gamma$, we define $\Gamma_{n,\alpha}$ as the unique closed interval $D_{n,j}^{(k-1)}$ with minimal index j such that

$$\alpha \leq \min D_{n,j+1}^{(k-1)}.$$

We note that $\Gamma_{n,\alpha}$ satisfies

$$\Gamma_{n_1,\alpha} \supseteq \Gamma_{n_2,\alpha} \qquad \text{for } n_1 \leq n_2,$$

and, by $(k-1)$-regularity,

$$|\Gamma_{n,\alpha}| \gtrsim_{\gamma,k} |\Gamma|.$$

Let $g_n = \sum_{j=1}^{n+k-1} w_j N_{n,j}^{(k)}$ be the unnormalized orthogonal spline function as in (4.1) and the coefficients (w_j) as in (4.3). For $\xi \in \Gamma$, we have (cf. (3.1))

$$|g_n'(\xi)| \lesssim_k \sum_j \frac{|w_j| + |w_{j-1}|}{|D_{n,j}^{(k-1)}|}, \tag{5.1}$$

where we sum only over those indices j such that $\Gamma \cap \operatorname{supp} N_{n,j}^{(k-1)} = \Gamma \cap D_{n,j}^{(k-1)} \neq \emptyset$. By $(k-1)$-regularity, all lengths $|D_{n,j}^{(k-1)}|$ in this summation range are comparable to $|\Gamma_{n,\alpha}|$. Moreover, by (4.6),

$$|w_j| \lesssim_k \frac{q^{d_n(\tau_{n,j})}}{|J_n| + \operatorname{dist}(D_{n,j}^{(k)}, J_n) + |D_{n,j}^{(k)}|}.$$

Again by $(k-1)$-regularity, for j in the summation range of the sum (5.1),

$$|D_{n,j}^{(k-1)}| \gtrsim_{k,\gamma} |\Gamma_{n,\alpha}|,$$
$$\operatorname{dist}(D_{n,j}^{(k)}, J_n) + |D_{n,j}^{(k)}| \gtrsim_{k,\gamma} \operatorname{dist}(J_n, \Gamma_{n,\alpha}) + |\Gamma_{n,\alpha}|.$$

Therefore, combining the above inequalities, we estimate the right hand side in (5.1) further and get, with the notation $\Gamma_n := \Gamma_{n,\alpha}$,

$$|g_n'(\xi)| \lesssim_{k,\gamma} \frac{1}{|\Gamma_n|} \frac{q^{d_n(\Gamma_n)}}{|J_n| + \operatorname{dist}(J_n, \Gamma_n) + |\Gamma_n|}. \tag{5.2}$$

As a consequence, for an arbitrary point $\tau \in \Gamma$,

$$|a_n| = \Big| \int_\Gamma \phi(t)[f_n(t) - f_n(\tau)]\,\mathrm{d}t \Big| \le \int_\Gamma \frac{1}{|\Gamma|} \sup_{\xi\in\Gamma} |f_n'(\xi)||t-\tau|\,\mathrm{d}t$$
$$\lesssim_k |\Gamma||J_n|^{1/2} \sup_{\xi\in\Gamma} |g_n'(\xi)| \lesssim_{k,\gamma} \frac{|\Gamma|}{|\Gamma_n|} \frac{|J_n|^{1/2} q^{d_n(\Gamma_n)}}{|J_n| + \operatorname{dist}(J_n,\Gamma_n) + |\Gamma_n|}.$$

Let $\Delta_1 \supset \cdots \supset \Delta_s$ be the collection of all different intervals appearing as Γ_n for $n \le n_\Gamma$. By Lemma 3.1, we have some geometric decay in the measure of Δ_i. Now fix Δ_i and $\ell \ge 0$ and consider indices $n \le n_\Gamma$ such that $\Gamma_n = \Delta_i$ and $d_n(\Gamma_n) = \ell$. By the latter display and Lemma 4.3,

$$|a_n|\|f_n\|_1 \lesssim_{k,\gamma} \frac{|\Gamma|}{|\Delta_i|} \frac{|J_n| q^\ell}{|J_n| + \operatorname{dist}(J_n,\Delta_i) + |\Delta_i|},$$

and thus, Lemma 4.7 implies

$$\sum_{n:\Gamma_n=\Delta_i,\, d_n(\Gamma_n)=\ell} |a_n|\|f_n\|_1 \lesssim_{k,\gamma} (\ell+1)^2 q^\ell \frac{|\Gamma|}{|\Delta_i|}.$$

Now, summing over ℓ and then over i (recall that $|\Delta_i|$ decays like a geometric progression by Lemma 3.1 and $|\Delta_i| \gtrsim_{k,\gamma} |\Gamma|$ since $n \le n_\Gamma$) yields

$$\sum_{n\le n_\Gamma} |a_n|\|f_n\|_1 \lesssim_{k,\gamma} 1.$$

This implies the desired inequality $\|P_1\phi\|_1 \lesssim_{k,\gamma} 1$ for the first part of $P\phi$.

Next, we look at $P_2\phi$ and define the set V as the smallest interval that has grid points in $\mathcal{T}_{n_\Gamma+1}$ as endpoints and which contains Γ. Moreover, $\widetilde{V}$ is defined to be the smallest interval with gridpoints in $\mathcal{T}_{n_\Gamma+1}$ as endpoints and such that $\widetilde{V}$ contains k grid points in $\mathcal{T}_{n_\Gamma+1}$ to the left of Γ and as well k grid points in $\mathcal{T}_{n_\Gamma+1}$ to the right of Γ. We observe that due to $(k-1)$-regularity and the fact that Γ contains at least k gridpoints from $\mathcal{T}_{n_\Gamma+1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |V| \sim_{k,\gamma} |\widetilde{V}| \sim_{k,\gamma} |\Gamma|, \\ |(\widetilde{V}\setminus V)\cap[0,\inf\Gamma]| \sim_{k,\gamma} |(\widetilde{V}\setminus V)\cap[\sup\Gamma,1]| \sim_{k,\gamma} |\widetilde{V}|. \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

First, we consider the integral of $P_2\phi$ over the set $\widetilde{V}$ and obtain by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$\int_{\widetilde{V}} P_2\phi(t)\,\mathrm{d}t \le \|\mathbb{1}_{\widetilde{V}}\|_2 \|\phi\|_2 \le \frac{|\widetilde{V}|^{1/2}}{|\Gamma|^{1/2}} \lesssim_{k,\gamma} 1.$$

It remains to estimate $\int_{\widetilde{V}^c} P_2\phi(t)\,\mathrm{d}t$. Since for $n > n_\Gamma$, the endpoints of $\widetilde{V}$ are grid points in $\mathcal{T}_n$, for J_n there are only the possibilities $J_n \subset \widetilde{V}$, J_n is to the right or J_n is to the left of $\widetilde{V}$. We begin with considering $J_n \subset \widetilde{V}$, in which case

$$|a_n| = \Big| \int_\Gamma \phi(t) f_n(t)\,\mathrm{d}t \Big| \le \frac{\|f_n\|_1}{|\Gamma|} \lesssim_k \frac{|J_n|^{1/2}}{|\Gamma|},$$

and therefore, by Lemma 4.6 and (5.3),

$$\sum_{n:J_n\subset\widetilde{V},n>n_\Gamma}|a_n|\int_{\widetilde{V}^c}|f_n(t)|\,\mathrm{d}t\lesssim_k\frac{1}{|\Gamma|}\sum_{n:J_n\subset\widetilde{V}}|J_n|^{1/2}\int_{\widetilde{V}^c}|f_n(t)|\,\mathrm{d}t$$
$$\lesssim_k\frac{|\widetilde{V}|}{|\Gamma|}\lesssim_{k,\gamma}1.$$

Now, let J_n be to the right of $\widetilde{V}$. The case of J_n to the left of $\widetilde{V}$ is then considered similarly. By (4.7) for $p=\infty$,

$$|a_n|\le\frac{1}{|\Gamma|}\int_\Gamma|f_n(t)|\,\mathrm{d}t\le\frac{1}{|\Gamma|}\int_V|f_n(t)|\,\mathrm{d}t\lesssim_{k,\gamma}\frac{q^{d_n(V)}|J_n|^{1/2}}{\operatorname{dist}(V,J_n)+|J_n|}.$$

This inequality, Lemma 4.3 and the fact that $\operatorname{dist}(V,J_n)\gtrsim_{k,\gamma}\operatorname{dist}(V,J_n)+|V|$ (cf. (5.3)) allow us to deduce

$$\sum_{\substack{n>n_\Gamma\\ J_n\text{ is to the right of }\widetilde{V}}}|a_n|\|f_n\|_1\lesssim_{k,\gamma}\sum_{\substack{n>n_\Gamma\\ J_n\text{ is to the right of }\widetilde{V}}}\frac{q^{d_n(V)}|J_n|}{\operatorname{dist}(V,J_n)+|V|}.$$

Note that V can be a union of $k-1$, k or $k+1$ intervals from $\mathcal{T}_{n_\Gamma+1}$; therefore, let V^+ be a union of $k-1$ grid intervals form $\mathcal{T}_{n_\Gamma+1}$, with right endpoint of V^+ coinciding with the right endpoint of V. Then, if J_n is to the right of V then $d_n(V)=d_n(V^+)$, $\operatorname{dist}(V,J_n)=\operatorname{dist}(V^+,J_n)$ and – because of $(k-1)$-regularity of the point sequence – $|V|\sim_{k,\gamma}|V^+|$, which implies

$$\sum_{\substack{n>n_\Gamma\\ J_n\text{ is to the right of }\widetilde{V}}}\frac{q^{d_n(V)}|J_n|}{\operatorname{dist}(V,J_n)+|V|}\lesssim_{k,\gamma}\sum_{\substack{n>n_\Gamma\\ J_n\text{ is to the right of }\widetilde{V}}}\frac{q^{d_n(V^+)}|J_n|}{\operatorname{dist}(V^+,J_n)+|V^+|}.$$

Finally, we employ Lemma 4.7 to conclude

$$\sum_{\substack{n>n_\Gamma\\ J_n\text{ is to the right of }\widetilde{V}}}|a_n|\|f_n\|_1\lesssim_{k,\gamma}\sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty}q^\ell\sum_{\substack{n>n_\Gamma\\ d_n(V^+)=\ell\\ J_n\text{ is to the right of }\widetilde{V}}}\frac{|J_n|}{\operatorname{dist}(V^+,J_n)+|V^+|}$$
$$\lesssim_{k,\gamma}\sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty}(\ell+1)^2q^\ell\lesssim_k1.$$

To conclude the proof, note that if $f\in H^1$ and $f=\sum_{m=1}^\infty c_m\phi_m$ is an atomic decomposition of f, then $\langle f,f_n\rangle=\sum_{m=1}^\infty c_m\langle\phi_m,f_n\rangle$, and $Pf(t)\le\sum_{m=1}^\infty|c_m|P\phi_m(t)$. □

Finally, we discuss (C) ⇒ (D).

Proposition 5.4 ((C) ⇒ (D))**.** *Let (t_n) be a k-admissible sequence of knots in $[0,1]$ satisfying the k-regularity condition with parameter γ and let (a_n) be a sequence of coefficients such that $S=\sup_m\left|\sum_{n\le m}a_nf_n\right|\in L^1$. Then, there exists a function $f\in H^1$ with $a_n=\langle f,f_n\rangle$ for each n. Moreover, we have the inequality*

$$\|f\|_{H^1}\lesssim_{k,\gamma}\|Sf\|_1.$$

Proof. If $S \in L^1$, then there is a function $f \in L^1$ such that $f = \sum_{n \geq -k+2} a_n f_n$ with convergence in L^1. Indeed, this is a consequence of the relative weak compactness of uniformly integrable subsets in L^1 and the basis property of (f_n) in L^1. Thus, we need only show that $f \in H^1$ and this is done by finding a suitable atomic decomposition of f.

We define $E_0 = B_0 = [0,1]$ and, for $r \geq 1$,

$$E_r = [S > 2^r], \qquad B_r = [\mathcal{M}\mathbb{1}_{E_r} > c_{k,\gamma}],$$

where $\mathcal{M}$ denotes the Hardy-Littlewood maximal function and $0 < c_{k,\gamma} \leq 1/2$ is a small constant only depending on k and γ which is chosen according to a few restrictions that will be given during the proof. We note that

$$\mathcal{M}\mathbb{1}_{E_r}(t) = \sup_{I \ni t} \frac{|I \cap E_r|}{|I|}, \qquad t \in [0,1],$$

where the supremum is taken over all intervals containing the point t. Since the Hardy-Littlewood maximal function operator $\mathcal{M}$ is of weak type $(1,1)$, we have the inequality $|B_r| \lesssim_{k,\gamma} |E_r|$. Due to the fact that $S \in L^1$, $|E_r| \to 0$ and, as a consequence, $|B_r| \to 0$ as $r \to \infty$. Now, decompose the open set B_r into a countable union of disjoint open intervals

$$B_r = \bigcup_{\kappa} \Gamma_{r,\kappa},$$

where for fixed r, no two intervals $\Gamma_{r,\kappa}$ have a common endpoint and the above equality is up to measure 0 (each open set of real numbers can be decomposed into a countable union of open intervals, but it can happen that two intervals have the same endpoint. In that case, we collect those two intervals to one $\Gamma_{r,\kappa}$). This can be achieved by taking as $\Gamma_{r,\kappa}$ the collection of level sets of positive measure of the function $t \to |[0,t] \cap B_r^c|$.

Moreover, observe that if $\Gamma_{r+1,\xi}$ is one of the intervals in the decomposition of B_{r+1}, then there is an interval $\Gamma_{r,\kappa}$ in the decomposition of B_r such that $\Gamma_{r+1,\xi} \subset \Gamma_{r,\kappa}$.

Based on this decomposition, we define the following functions for $r \geq 0$:

$$g_r(t) := \begin{cases} f(t), & t \in B_r^c, \\ \frac{1}{|\Gamma_{r,\kappa}|} \int_{\Gamma_{r,\kappa}} f(t)\,\mathrm{d}t, & t \in \Gamma_{r,\kappa}. \end{cases}$$

Observe that $f = g_0 + \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} (g_{r+1} - g_r)$ in L^1 and $g_{r+1} - g_r = 0$ on B_r^c. As a consequence,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Gamma_{r,\kappa}} g_{r+1}(t)\,\mathrm{d}t &= \int_{\Gamma_{r,\kappa} \cap B_{r+1}^c} g_{r+1}(t)\,\mathrm{d}t + \int_{\Gamma_{r,\kappa} \cap B_{r+1}} g_{r+1}(t)\,\mathrm{d}t \\ &= \int_{\Gamma_{r,\kappa} \cap B_{r+1}^c} f(t)\,\mathrm{d}t + \sum_{\xi\,:\,\Gamma_{r+1,\xi} \subset \Gamma_{r,\kappa}} \int_{\Gamma_{r+1,\xi}} f(t)\,\mathrm{d}t \\ &= \int_{\Gamma_{r,\kappa}} f(t)\,\mathrm{d}t = \int_{\Gamma_{r,\kappa}} g_r(t)\,\mathrm{d}t. \end{aligned}$$

The main step of the proof is to show that

$$|g_r(t)| \leq C_{k,\gamma} 2^r, \qquad \text{a.e. } t \in [0,1] \tag{5.4}$$

for some constant $C_{k,\gamma}$ only depending on k and γ. Once this inequality is proved, we take $\phi_0 \equiv 1$, $\eta_0 = \int_0^1 f(u)\,\mathrm{d}u$ and

$$\phi_{r,\kappa} := \frac{(g_{r+1} - g_r)\mathbb{1}_{\Gamma_{r,\kappa}}}{C_{k,\gamma} 2^r |\Gamma_{r,\kappa}|}, \qquad \eta_{r,\kappa} = C_{k,\gamma} 2^r |\Gamma_{r,\kappa}|$$

and observe that $f = \eta_0\phi_0 + \sum_{r,\kappa} \eta_{r,\kappa}\phi_{r,\kappa}$ is the desired atomic decomposition of f since

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{r,\kappa} \eta_{r,\kappa} &\le C_{k,\gamma} \sum_{r,\kappa} 2^r |\Gamma_{r,\kappa}| = C_{k,\gamma} \sum_r 2^r |B_r| \\ &\lesssim_{k,\gamma} \sum_r 2^r |E_r| \lesssim \|S\|_1.\end{aligned}$$

Thus it remains to prove inequality (5.4).

In order to do this, we first assume $t \in B_r^c$. Additionally, assume that t is a point such that the series $\sum_n a_n f_n(t)$ converges to $f(t)$ and that t does not occur in the grid point sequence (t_n). By Theorem 3.5, this holds for a.e. point in $[0,1]$. We fix the index m and let V_m be the maximal interval where the function $S_m := \sum_{n \le m} a_n f_n$ is a polynomial of order k that contains the point t. Then, $V_m \not\subset B_r$ and since V_m is an interval containing the point t,

$$|V_m \cap E_r^c| \ge (1 - c_{k,\gamma})|V_m| \ge |V_m|/2.$$

Since $|S_m| \le 2^r$ on E_r^c, the above display and Proposition 3.2 imply $|S_m| \lesssim_k 2^r$ on V_m and in particular $|S_m(t)| \lesssim_k 2^r$. Now, $S_m(t) \to f(t)$ as $m \to \infty$ by the assumptions on t and thus,

$$|g_r(t)| = |f(t)| \lesssim_k 2^r.$$

This concludes the proof of (5.4) in the case of $t \in B_r^c$.

Next, we fix an index κ and consider g_r on $\Gamma := [\alpha, \beta] := \Gamma_{r,\kappa}$. Let n_Γ be the first index such that there are $k+1$ points from $\mathcal{T}_{n_\Gamma}$ contained in Γ, i.e., there exists a support $D_{n_\Gamma,i}^{(k)}$ of a B-spline function of order k in the grid $\mathcal{T}_{n_\Gamma}$ that is contained in Γ. Additionally, we define the intervals

$$U_0 := [\tau_{n_\Gamma, i-k}, \tau_{n_\Gamma, i}], \qquad W_0 := [\tau_{n_\Gamma, i+k}, \tau_{n_\Gamma, i+2k}].$$

Note that if $\alpha \in \mathcal{T}_{n_\Gamma}$, then α is a common endpoint of U_0 and Γ, otherwise α is an interior point of U_0. Similarly, if $\beta \in \mathcal{T}_{n_\Gamma}$, then β is a common endpoint of W_0 and Γ, otherwise β is an interior point of W_0. By k-regularity of the point sequence (t_n), $\max(|U_0|, |W_0|) \lesssim_{k,\gamma} |\Gamma|$. We first estimate the part $S_\Gamma := \sum_{n \le n_\Gamma} a_n f_n$ and show the inequality $|S_\Gamma| \lesssim_{k,\gamma} 2^r$ on Γ. Observe that on $\Delta := U_0 \cup \Gamma \cup W_0$, S_Γ can be represented as a linear combination of B-splines (N_j) on the grid $\mathcal{T}_{n_\Gamma}$ of the form

$$S_\Gamma(t) = h(t) := \sum_{j=i-2k+1}^{i+2k-1} b_j N_j(t),$$

for some coefficients (b_j). For $j = i - 2k + 1, \dots, i + 2k - 1$, let J_j be a maximal interval of $\operatorname{supp} N_j$ and observe that due to k-regularity, $|J_j| \sim_{k,\gamma} |\Gamma| \sim_{k,\gamma} |\operatorname{supp} h|$.

If we assume that $\max_{J_j}|S_\Gamma| > C_k 2^r$, where C_k is the constant obtained from Proposition 3.2 with $\rho = 1/2$, then Proposition 3.2 implies that $|S_\Gamma| > 2^r$ on a subset I_j of J_j with measure $\geq |J_j|/2$. As a consequence,

$$|\operatorname{supp} h \cap E_r| \geq |J_j \cap E_r| \geq |J_j|/2 \gtrsim_{k,\gamma} |\operatorname{supp} h|.$$

We choose the constant $c_{k,\gamma}$ in the definition of B_r sufficiently small to guarantee that this last inequality implies $\operatorname{supp} h \subset B_r$. This is a contradiction to the choice of Γ, which implies that our assumption $\max_{J_j}|S_\Gamma| > C_k 2^r$ is not true and thus

$$\max_{J_j}|S_\Gamma| \leq C_k 2^r, \qquad j = i-2k+1,\dots,i+2k-1.$$

By local stability of B-splines, i.e., inequality (3.2) in Proposition 3.3, this implies

$$|b_j| \lesssim_k 2^r, \qquad j = i-2k+1,\dots,i+2k-1,$$

and so $|S_\Gamma| \lesssim_k 2^r$ on Δ. This means

$$\int_\Gamma |S_\Gamma| \lesssim_k 2^r |\Gamma|, \tag{5.5}$$

which is inequality (5.4) for the part S_Γ.

In order to estimate the remaining part, we inductively define two sequences $(u_s, U_s)_{i\geq 0}$ and $(w_s, W_s)_{s\geq 0}$ consisting of integers and intervals. Set $u_0 = w_0 = n_\Gamma$ and inductively define u_{s+1} to be the first index $n > u_s$ such that $t_n \in U_s$. Moreover, define U_{s+1} to be the B-spline support $D_{u_{s+1},i^{(k)}}$ in the grid $\mathcal{T}_{u_{s+1}}$, where i is the minimal index such that $D^{(k)}_{u_{s+1},i} \cap \Gamma \neq \emptyset$. Similarly, we define w_{s+1} to be the first index $n > w_s$ such that $t_n \in W_s$ and W_{s+1} as the B-spline support $D^{(k)}_{w_{s+1},i}$ in the grid $\mathcal{T}_{w_{s+1}}$, where i is the maximal index such that $D^{(k)}_{w_{s+1},i} \cap \Gamma \neq \emptyset$. It can easily be seen that this construction implies $U_{s+1} \subset U_s$, $W_{s+1} \subset W_s$ and $\alpha \in U_s$, $\beta \in W_s$ for all $s \geq 0$, or more precisely: if $\alpha \in \mathcal{T}_{u_s}$, then α is a common endpoint of U_s and Γ, otherwise α is an inner point of U_s, and similarly, if $\beta \in \mathcal{T}_{u_s}$, then β is a common endpoint of W_s and Γ, otherwise β is an inner point of W_s.

For a pair of indices ℓ, m, let

$$x_\ell := \sum_{\nu=0}^{k-1} N_{u_\ell, i+\nu} \mathbb{1}_{U_\ell}, \qquad y_m := \sum_{\nu=0}^{k-1} N_{w_m, j-\nu} \mathbb{1}_{W_m},$$

where $N_{u_\ell,i}$ is the B-spline function on the grid $\mathcal{T}_{u_\ell}$ with support U_ℓ and $N_{w_m,j}$ is the B-spline function on the grid $\mathcal{T}_{w_m}$ with support W_m. The function

$$\phi_{\ell,m} := x_\ell + \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma\setminus(U_\ell \cup W_m)} + y_m$$

is zero on $(U_\ell \cup \Gamma \cup W_m)^c$, one on $\Gamma \setminus (U_\ell \cup W_m)$ and a piecewise polynomial function of order k in between. For $\ell, m \geq 0$, consider the following subsets of $\{n : n > n_\Gamma\}$:

$$L(\ell) := \{n : u_\ell < n \leq u_{\ell+1}\}, \qquad R(m) := \{n : w_m < n \leq w_{m+1}\}.$$

If $n \in L(\ell) \cap R(m)$, we clearly have $\langle f_n, \phi_{\ell,m} \rangle = 0$ and thus

$$\int_\Gamma f_n(t)\,\mathrm{d}t = \int_\Gamma f_n(t)\,\mathrm{d}t - \int_0^1 f_n(t)\phi_{\ell,m}(t)\,\mathrm{d}t = A_\ell(f_n) + B_m(f_n), \tag{5.6}$$

where

$$A_\ell(f_n) := \int_{\Gamma\cap U_\ell} f_n(t)\,\mathrm{d}t - \int_{U_\ell} f_n(t)x_\ell(t)\,\mathrm{d}t,$$
$$B_m(f_n) := \int_{\Gamma\cap W_m} f_n(t)\,\mathrm{d}t - \int_{W_m} f_n(t)y_m(t)\,\mathrm{d}t.$$

This implies

(5.7)

$$\Big|\int_\Gamma \sum_{n=n_\Gamma+1}^{\infty} a_n f_n(t)\,\mathrm{d}t\Big| = \Big|\sum_{\ell,m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{n\in L(\ell)\cap R(m)} a_n\big(A_\ell(f_n) + B_m(f_n)\big)\Big|$$
$$\le 2\sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty}\int_{U_\ell}\Big|\sum_{n\in L(\ell)} a_n f_n(t)\Big|\,\mathrm{d}t + 2\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}\int_{W_m}\Big|\sum_{n\in R(m)} a_n f_n(t)\Big|\,\mathrm{d}t.$$

Consider the first sum on the right hand side. On $U_\ell = D^{(k)}_{u_\ell,i}$, the function $\sum_{n\in L(\ell)} a_n f_n$ can be represented as a linear combination of B-splines (N_j) on the grid $\mathcal{T}_{u_\ell}$ of the form

$$\sum_{n\in L(\ell)} a_n f_n = h_\ell := \sum_{j=i-k+1}^{i+k-1} b_j N_j,$$

for some coefficients (b_j). For $j = i-k+1,\dots,i+k-1$, let J_j be a maximal grid interval of $\operatorname{supp} N_j$ and observe that due to k-regularity, $|J_j| \sim_{k,\gamma} |U_\ell| \sim_{k,\gamma} |\operatorname{supp} h_\ell|$. On J_j, the function $\sum_{n\in L(\ell)} a_n f_n$ is a polynomial of order k. If we assume $\max_{J_j}\big|\sum_{n\in L(\ell)} a_n f_n\big| > C_k 2^{r+1}$, where C_k is the constant obtained from Proposition 3.2 with $\rho = 1/2$, then Proposition 3.2 implies that $\big|\sum_{n\in L(\ell)} a_n f_n\big| > 2^{r+1}$ on a set $J_j^* \subset J_j$ with $|J_j^*| = |J_j|/2$, but this means $\max\big(|\sum_{n\le u_\ell} a_n f_n\big|, |\sum_{n\le u_{\ell+1}} a_n f_n\big|\big) > 2^r$ on the set J_j^*. As a consequence,

$$|E_r \cap \operatorname{supp} h_\ell| \ge |E_r \cap J_j| \ge |J_j^*| \ge |J_j|/2 \gtrsim_k |\operatorname{supp} h_\ell|.$$

We choose the constant $c_{k,\gamma}$ in the definition of B_r sufficiently small to guarantee that this last inequality implies $\operatorname{supp} h_\ell \subset B_r$. This is a contradiction to the choice of Γ, which implies that our assumption $\max_{J_j}\big|\sum_{n\in L(\ell)} a_n f_n\big| > C_k 2^r$ is not true and thus

$$\max_{J_j}\Big|\sum_{n\in L(\ell)} a_n f_n\Big| \le C_k 2^r, \qquad j = i-k+1,\dots,i+k-1.$$

By local stability of B-splines, i.e., inequality (3.2) in Proposition 3.3, this implies

$$|b_j| \lesssim_k 2^r, \qquad j = i-k+1,\dots,i+k-1,$$

and so $\big|\sum_{n\in L(\ell)} a_n f_n\big| \lesssim_k 2^r$ on U_ℓ, which gives

$$\int_{U_\ell} \big|\sum_{n\in L(\ell)} a_n f_n\big| \lesssim_k 2^r |U_\ell|.$$

Combining Lemma 3.1, the inclusions $U_{\ell+1}\subset U_\ell$ and the inequality $|U_0|\lesssim_{k,\gamma} |\Gamma|$, we see that $\sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty}|U_\ell|\lesssim_{k,\gamma}|\Gamma|$. Thus we get

$$\sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty}\int_{U_\ell} \big|\sum_{n\in L(\ell)} a_n f_n\big| \lesssim_{k,\gamma} 2^r|\Gamma|.$$

The second sum on the right hand side of (5.7) is estimated similarly which gives

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}\int_{W_m} \big|\sum_{n\in R(m)} a_n f_n\big| \lesssim_{k,\gamma} 2^r|\Gamma|.$$

Combining these estimates with (5.7) and (5.5), we find

$$\Big|\int_\Gamma f(t)\,\mathrm{d}t\Big| = \Big|\int_\Gamma \sum_n a_n f_n(t)\,\mathrm{d}t\Big| \lesssim_{k,\gamma} 2^r|\Gamma|,$$

which implies (5.4) on Γ and therefore, the proof of the propositon is completed. □

6. Proof of the main theorem

For the proof of the necessity part of Theorem 2.4, we will use the following:

Proposition 6.1. *Let (t_n) be a k-admissible sequence of knots satisfying the k-regularity condition with parameter γ, but which is not satisfying any $(k-1)$-regularity condition. Then,*

$$\sup \|\sup_n |a_n(\phi) f_n|\|_1 = \infty,$$

where sup *is taken over all atoms ϕ and $a_n(\phi) := \langle \phi, f_n\rangle$.*

Proposition 6.1 implies in particular that Proposition 5.3 cannot be extended to arbitrary partitions. For the proof of Proposition 6.1 we need the following technical Lemma 6.2.

Lemma 6.2. *Let (t_n) be a k-admissible sequence of knots satisfying the k-regularity condition with parameter $\gamma\geq 1$, but is not satisfying any $(k-1)$-regularity condition. Let ℓ be an arbitrary positive integer. Then, for all $A\geq 2$, there exists a finite increasing sequence $(n_j)_{j=0}^{\ell-1}$ of length ℓ such that if τ_{n_j,i_j} is the new point in $\mathcal{T}_{n_j}$ that is not present in $\mathcal{T}_{n_j-1}$ and*

$$\Lambda_j := [\tau_{n_j,i_j-k}, \tau_{n_j,i_j-1}), \qquad L_j := [\tau_{n_j,i_j-1}, \tau_{n_j,i_j}), \qquad R_j := [\tau_{n_j,i_j}, \tau_{n_j,i_j+1}),$$

we have for all indices i,j in the range $0\leq i<j\leq \ell-1$

(1) $R_i\cap R_j=\emptyset$,
(2) $\Lambda_i=\Lambda_j$,
(3) $(2\gamma-1)|L_j|\geq |[\tau_{n_j,i_j-k-1},\tau_{n_j,i_j-k}]|\geq \frac{|L_j|}{2\gamma}$,

(4) $|R_j| \le (2\gamma-1)|L_j|$,
(5) $|L_j| \le 2(\gamma+1)k \cdot |R_j|$,
(6) $\min(|L_j|, |R_j|) \ge A|\Lambda_j|$.

Proof. First, we choose a sequence $(n_j)_{j=0}^{lk}$ so that (1) – (4) hold. Next, we choose $(n_{m_j})_{j=0}^{l-1}$ – a subsequence of $(n_j)_{j=0}^{lk}$ – so that (5) and (6) hold as well.

The sequence (t_n) does not satisfy any $(k-1)$-regularity condition. As a consequence, for all C_0 there exists an index n_0 and an index i_0 such that

$$\text{either} \quad C_0|D^{(k-1)}_{n_0,i_0-k}| \le |D^{(k-1)}_{n_0,i_0-k+1}| \quad \text{or} \quad |D^{(k-1)}_{n_0,i_0-k}| \ge C_0|D^{(k-1)}_{n_0,i_0-k+1}|. \tag{6.1}$$

We choose C_0 sufficiently large such that with $C_j := C_{j-1}/\gamma - 1$ for $j \ge 1$, the condition $C_{k\ell} \ge 2\gamma$ is true. We will give an additional restriction for C_0 at the end of the proof. Without loss of generality, we can assume that the first inequality in (6.1) holds. Taking $\Lambda_0 = [\tau_{n_0,i_0-k}, \tau_{n_0,i_0-1})$ and $L_0 = [\tau_{n_0,i_0-1}, \tau_{n_0,i_0})$, $R_0 = [\tau_{n_0,i_0}, \tau_{n_0,i_0+1})$, we have

$$|[\tau_{n_0,i_0-k+1}, \tau_{n_0,i_0}]| \ge C_0|\Lambda_0|. \tag{6.2}$$

A direct consequence of (6.2) is

$$|L_0| \ge (C_0-1)|\Lambda_0|. \tag{6.3}$$

By k-regularity we have

$$|D^{(k)}_{n_0,i_0-k-1}| \ge \frac{|D^{(k)}_{n_0,i_0-k}|}{\gamma} = \frac{|\Lambda_0|+|L_0|}{\gamma},$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} |[\tau_{n_0,i_0-k-1}, \tau_{n_0,i_0-k}]| &= |D^{(k)}_{n_0,i_0-k-1}| - |\Lambda_0| \\ &\ge \frac{|\Lambda_0|+|L_0|}{\gamma} - |\Lambda_0| \\ &\ge \frac{|L_0|}{2\gamma} + \frac{|\Lambda_0|}{\gamma} + \frac{C_0-1}{2\gamma}|\Lambda_0| - |\Lambda_0| \\ &= \frac{|L_0|}{2\gamma} + \Big(\frac{C_0+1}{2\gamma} - 1\Big)|\Lambda_0| \ge \frac{|L_0|}{2\gamma}, \end{aligned} \tag{6.4}$$

i.e., the right hand side inequality of (3) for $j=0$. To get the upper estimate, note that by k-regularity

$$|\Lambda_0| + |[\tau_{n_0,i_0-k-1}, \tau_{n_0,i_0-k}]| \le \gamma(|\Lambda_0|+|L_0|),$$

hence by (6.3)

$$|[\tau_{n_0,i_0-k-1}, \tau_{n_0,i_0-k}]| \le \gamma|L_0| + (\gamma-1)|\Lambda_0| \le (2\gamma-1)|L_0|. \tag{6.5}$$

This and the previous calculation give (3) for $j=0$. Therefore, the construction below can be continued either to the right or to the left of Λ_0. We continue our construction to the right of Λ_0.

We continue by induction. Having defined n_j, Λ_j, L_j and R_j, we take

$$n_{j+1} := \min\{n > n_j : t_n \in \Lambda_j \cup L_j\}, \qquad j \ge 0.$$

By definition of R_j and n_{j+1}, property (1) is satisfied for all $j \geq 0$. We identify $t_{n_{j+1}} = \tau_{n_{j+1},i_{j+1}}$. Thus, by construction, $t_{n_j} = \tau_{n_j,i_j}$ is a common endpoint of L_j and R_j for $j \geq 1$.

In order to prove (2), we will show by induction that

$$|[\tau_{n_j,i_j-k+1}, \tau_{n_j,i_j}]| \geq C_j|\Lambda_j| \qquad \text{and} \qquad \Lambda_{j+1} = \Lambda_j \tag{6.6}$$

for all $j = 0, \ldots, k\ell$. We remark that the equation $\Lambda_{j+1} = \Lambda_j$ is equivalent to the condition $\tau_{n_{j+1},i_{j+1}} \in L_j$.

The first inequality of (6.6) for $j = 0$ is exactly (6.2). If the second identity in (6.6) were not satisfied for $j = 0$, i.e., $\tau_{n_1,i_1} \in \Lambda_0$, we would have by k-regularity of the point sequence (t_n), applied to the partition $\mathcal{T}_{n_1}$,

$$|\Lambda_0| \geq \frac{1}{\gamma}|L_0|,$$

which contradicts (6.3) for our choice of C_0. This means we have $\Lambda_1 = \Lambda_0$, and so, (6.6) is true for $j = 0$. Next, assume that (6.6) is satisfied for $j-1$, where j is in the range $1 \leq j \leq k\ell - 1$. By k-regularity, applied to the partition $\mathcal{T}_{n_j}$, and employing repeatedly (6.6) for $j-1$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\Lambda_j| + |L_j| = |\Lambda_j \cup L_j| &\geq \frac{1}{\gamma}(\tau_{n_j,i_j+1} - \tau_{n_j,i_j-k+1}) \\ &= \frac{1}{\gamma}(\tau_{n_{j-1},i_{j-1}} - \tau_{n_{j-1},i_{j-1}-k+1}) \\ &\geq \frac{C_{j-1}}{\gamma}|\Lambda_{j-1}| = \frac{C_{j-1}}{\gamma}|\Lambda_j|. \end{aligned}$$

This means, by the recursive definition of C_j,

$$|L_j| \geq C_j|\Lambda_j|, \tag{6.7}$$

and in particular the first identity in (6.6) is true for j. If the second identity in (6.6) were not satisfied for j, i.e., $\tau_{n_{j+1},i_{j+1}} \in \Lambda_j$, we would have by k-regularity of the point sequence (t_n), applied to the partition $\mathcal{T}_{n_{j+1}}$,

$$|\Lambda_j| \geq \frac{1}{\gamma}|L_j|,$$

which contradicts (6.7) and our choice of C_0. This proves (6.6) for j and thus, property (2) is true for all $j = 0, \ldots, k\ell$.

Moreover, choosing C_0 sufficiently large – that is, such that $C_{kl} \geq 2(\gamma + 1)kA$, (6.7) implies

$$|L_j| \geq 2(\gamma + 1)kA|\Lambda_j|, \tag{6.8}$$

which is a part of (6).

The lower estimate in property (3) is proved by repeating the argument giving (6.4) and using (6.7) instead of (6.4). Moreover, the upper estimate also uses the same arguments as the proof of (6.5), but now we have to use (6.7) as well.

Next, we look at property (4). By k-regularity and (6.7), as $C_j > 1$, we have

$$|R_j| + |L_j| \leq \gamma(|L_j| + |\Lambda_j|) \leq 2\gamma|L_j|,$$

which is exactly property (4).

We prove property (5) by choosing a suitable subsequence of $(n_j)_{j=0}^{k\ell}$ and begin with assuming the contrary to (5) for k consecutive indices, i.e., for an index s,

$$|R_{s+r}| < \alpha |L_{s+r}| \le \alpha |L_s|, \qquad r = 1, \dots, k, \tag{6.9}$$

where $\alpha := \big(2(\gamma+1)k\big)^{-1}$. We have $L_j = L_{j+1} \cup R_{j+1}$ for $0 \le j \le k\ell - 1$. Thus, on the one hand,

$$|L_s \setminus L_{s+k}| = \sum_{r=1}^{k} |R_{s+r}| \le \alpha k |L_s| \tag{6.10}$$

by (6.9); on the other hand, by k-regularity of the partition $\mathcal{T}_{n_{s+k}}$,

$$|L_s \setminus L_{s+k}| \ge \frac{1}{\gamma}|L_{s+k}| = \frac{1}{\gamma}\Big(|L_s| - \sum_{r=1}^{k} |R_{s+r}|\Big) \ge \frac{1-\alpha k}{\gamma}|L_s|. \tag{6.11}$$

Now, (6.10) contradicts (6.11) for our choice of α. We thus have proved that for k consecutive indices $s+1, \dots, s+k$, there is at least one index $s+r$, $1 \le r \le k$, such that (5) is satisfied for $s+r$. As a consequence we can extract a sequence of length ℓ from $(n_j)_{j=1}^{k\ell}$ satisfying (5). Without restriction, this subsequence is called $(n_j)_{j=0}^{\ell-1}$ again.

Property (6) for R_j is now a simple consequence of (6.8), property (5) and the choice of the subsequence $(n_j)_{j=0}^{\ell-1}$. Therefore, the proof of the lemma is completed. □

Now, we are ready to proceed with the proof of Proposition 6.1.

Proof of Proposition 6.1. Let ℓ be an arbitrary positive integer and $A \ge 2$ a number that will be chosen later. Then, Lemma 6.2 gives us a sequence $(n_j)_{j=0}^{\ell-1}$ such that all conditions in Lemma 6.2 are satisfied. We assume that $|\Lambda_0| > 0$. Let $\tau := \tau_{n_0, i_0 - 1}$, $x := \tau - 2|\Lambda_0|$ and $y := \tau + 2|\Lambda_0|$. Then we define the atom ϕ by

$$\phi \equiv \frac{1}{4|\Lambda_0|}(\mathbb{1}_{[x,\tau]} - \mathbb{1}_{[\tau,y]})$$

and let j be an arbitrary integer in the range $0 \le j \le \ell - 1$. By partial integration, the expression $a_{n_j}(\phi) = \langle \phi, f_{n_j} \rangle$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} 4|\Lambda_0| a_{n_j}(\phi) &= \int_x^\tau f_{n_j}(t)\,\mathrm{d}t - \int_\tau^y f_{n_j}(t)\,\mathrm{d}t \\ &= \int_x^\tau f_{n_j}(t) - f_{n_j}(\tau)\,\mathrm{d}t - \int_\tau^y f_{n_j}(t) - f_{n_j}(\tau)\,\mathrm{d}t \\ &= \int_x^\tau (x-t) f'_{n_j}(t)\,\mathrm{d}t - \int_\tau^y (y-t) f'_{n_j}(t)\,\mathrm{d}t. \end{aligned}$$

In order to estimate $|a_{n_j}(\phi)|$ from below, we estimate the absolute values of $I_1 := \int_x^\tau (x-t) f'_{n_j}(t)\,\mathrm{d}t$ from below and of $I_2 := \int_\tau^y (y-t) f'_{n_j}(t)\,\mathrm{d}t$ from above and begin with I_2.

Consider the function g_{n_j}, which is connected to f_{n_j} via $f_{n_j} = g_{n_j}/\|g_{n_j}\|_2$ and $\|g_{n_j}\|_2 \sim_k |J_{n_j}|^{-1/2}$ (cf. (4.1) and Lemma 4.3). In the notation of Lemma 6.2, g_{n_j} is obtained by inserting the point $t_{n_j} = \tau_{n_j,i_j}$ to $\mathcal{T}_{n_j-1}$, and it is a common endpoint of intervals L_i and R_i. By construction of the characteristic interval J_{n_j}, Lemma 6.2 properties (4) – (6), and the k-regularity of the point sequence (t_n), we have

$$|J_{n_j}| \sim_{k,\gamma} |L_j| \sim_{k,\gamma} |R_j|. \tag{6.12}$$

By Lemma 6.2, property (6), we have $[\tau, y] \subset L_j$, and therefore on $[\tau, y]$, the derivative of the function g_{n_j} has the representation (cf. (3.1))

$$g'_{n_j}(u) = (k-1) \sum_{i=i_j-k+1}^{i_j-1} \xi_i N^{(k-1)}_{n_j,i}(u), \qquad u \in [\tau, y],$$

where $\xi_i = (w_i - w_{i-1})/|D^{(k-1)}_{n_j,i}|$ and the coefficients w_i are given by (4.3) associated to the partition $\mathcal{T}_{n_j}$. For $i = i_j - k + 1, \dots i_j - 1$ we have $L_j \subset D^{(k-1)}_{n_j,i}$, which in combination with the k-regularity of the point sequence (t_n) and Lemma 6.2 property (6) implies

$$|J_{n_j}| \sim_k |L_j| \sim_{k,\gamma} |D^{(k-1)}_{n_j,i}|, \qquad i = i_j - k + 1, \dots i_j - 1. \tag{6.13}$$

Moreover, by Lemma 4.4,

$$|w_i| \lesssim_k \frac{1}{|J_{n_j}|}, \qquad 1 \le i \le n_j + k - 1.$$

Therefore

$$|f'_{n_j}(t)| \sim_k |J_{n_j}|^{1/2} |g'_{n_j}(t)| \lesssim_{k,\gamma} |L_j|^{-3/2} \quad \text{for} \quad t \in [\tau, y].$$

Consequently, putting the above facts together,

$$|I_2| \lesssim_{k,\gamma} |\Lambda_0|^2 \cdot |L_j|^{-3/2}. \tag{6.14}$$

We continue with the estimate of I_1. By properties (3) and (6) of Lemma 6.2 (with $A \ge 2\gamma$), we have $[x, \tau] \subset [\tau_{n_j,i_j-k-1}, \tau_{n_j,i_j-1}]$ and, therefore, on $[x, \tau]$, g'_{n_j} has the representation (cf. (3.1))

$$g'_{n_j}(u) = (k-1) \sum_{i=i_j-2k+1}^{i_j-2} \xi_i N^{(k-1)}_{n_j,i}(u), \qquad u \in [x, \tau].$$

We split the integral I_1 as a sum $I_1 = I_{1,1} + I_{1,2}$ corresponding to the indices $i \ne i_j - k$ and $i = i_j - k$ in the above representation of g_{n_j} on $[x, \tau]$.

Note that $[\tau_{n_j,i_j-k-1}, \tau_{n_j,i_j-k}] \subset D^{(k-1)}_{n_j,i}$ for $i_j - 2k + 1 \le i < i_j - k$ and $L_j \subset D^{(k-1)}_{n_j,i}$ for $i_j - k < i \le i_j - 2$. Therefore, by properties (3) and (6) of Lemma 6.2 and the k-regularity of the sequence of knots we have

$$|D^{(k-1)}_{n_j,i}| \sim_{k,\gamma} |L_j| \quad \text{for} \quad i_j - 2k + 1 \le i \le i_j - 2, \quad i \ne i_j - k.$$

So, by arguments analogous to the proof of (6.14) we get

(6.15)
$$|I_{1,1}| \sim_k |J_{n_j}|^{1/2} \Big| \int_x^\tau (t-x) \sum_{\substack{i=i_j-2k+1 \\ i\neq i_j-k}}^{i_j-2} \xi_i N_{n_j,i}^{(k-1)}(t)\,\mathrm{d}t \Big| \lesssim_{k,\gamma} |\Lambda_0|^2 \cdot |L_j|^{-3/2}.$$

Moreover, for $i = i_j - k$, we have $D_{n_j,i_j-k}^{(k-1)} = \Lambda_0$, so we get

$$\begin{aligned} |I_{1,2}| &\sim_k |J_{n_j}|^{1/2} \Big| \int_x^\tau (t-x)\xi_{i_j-k} N_{n_j,i_j-k}^{(k-1)}(t)\,\mathrm{d}t \Big| \\ &\geq |\xi_{i_j-k}||J_{n_j}|^{1/2}|\Lambda_0| \int_x^\tau N_{n_j,i_j-k}^{(k-1)}(t)\,\mathrm{d}t \qquad (6.16) \\ &= |\xi_{i_j-k}||\Lambda_0||J_{n_j}|^{1/2} \frac{|D_{n_j,i_j-k}^{(k-1)}|}{k-1} = |\xi_{i_j-k}||J_{n_j}|^{1/2} \frac{|\Lambda_0|^2}{k-1}, \end{aligned}$$

due to the fact that $t - x \geq |\Lambda_0|$ for $t \in \operatorname{supp} N_{n_j,i_j-k}^{(k-1)}$. Since the sequence w_j is checkerboard, cf. (4.4),

$$|\xi_{i_j-k}| = \frac{|w_{i_j-k}| + |w_{i_j-k-1}|}{|D_{n_j,i_j-k}^{(k-1)}|} \geq \frac{|w_{i_j-k}|}{|D_{n_j,i_j-k}^{(k-1)}|}.$$

By definition of w_{i_j-k},

$$|w_{i_j-k}| \geq |\alpha_{i_j-k}||b_{i_j-k,i_j-k}|,$$

where α_{i_j-k} is the factor from formula (4.2) and b_{i_j-k,i_j-k} is an entry of the inverse of the B-spline Gram matrix, both corresponding to the partition $\mathcal{T}_{n_j}$. Formulas (4.2) and (6.12) imply that α_{i_j-k} is bounded from below by a positive constant that is only depending on k and γ.[1] Moreover, $|b_{i_j-k,i_j-k}| \geq \|N_{n_j,i_j-k}^{(k)}\|_2^{-2} \gtrsim_k |D_{n_j,i_j-k}^{(k)}|^{-1}$, cf. (3.6). Note that $D_{n_j,i_j-k}^{(k)} = \Lambda_0 \cup L_j$, so $|D_{n_j,i_j-k}^{(k)}| \sim_{k,\gamma} |L_j|$. Thus, $|\xi_{i_j-k}| \gtrsim_{k,\gamma} |\Lambda_0|^{-1}|L_j|^{-1}$. Inserting the above calculations in (6.16), we find

$$|I_{1,2}| \gtrsim_{k,\gamma} |J_{n_j}|^{1/2} \frac{|\Lambda_0|}{|L_j|} \sim_{k,\gamma} |\Lambda_0||L_j|^{-1/2}. \qquad (6.17)$$

We now impose conditions on the constant $A \geq 2\gamma$ from the beginning of the proof and property (6) in Lemma 6.2. It follows by (6.17), (6.15) and (6.14) that there are $C_{k,\gamma} > 0$ and $c_{k,\gamma} > 0$, depending only on k and γ such that

$$\begin{aligned} 4|\Lambda_0||a_{n_j}(\phi)| &\geq |I_{1,2}| - |I_{1,1}| - |I_2| \geq C_{k,\gamma}|\Lambda_0||L_j|^{-1/2} - c_{k,\gamma}|\Lambda_0|^2|L_j|^{-3/2} \\ &= |\Lambda_0||L_j|^{-1/2}(C_{k,\gamma} - c_{k,\gamma}|\Lambda_0||L_j|^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

[1]Formula (4.2) is applied with $\mathcal{T}_n = \mathcal{T}_{n_j}$ and corresponding to $\tau_{i_0} = \tau_{n_j,i_j}$. Then $[\tau_{i_0-1}, \tau_{i_0}] = L_j$ and $[\tau_{i_0}, \tau_{i_0+1}] = R_j$. Because of k-regularity and $|\Lambda_0 \cup L_j| \sim_{k,\gamma} |L_j|$, each denominator in (4.2) is $\sim_{k,\gamma} |L_j|$. Each nominator in (4.2) is bigger than either L_j or R_j, so by (6.12) and k-regularity it is $\sim_{k,\gamma} |L_j|$ as well.

By property (6) in Lemma 6.2 we have $|\Lambda_0||L_j|^{-1} \leq 1/A$. Choosing A sufficiently large to guarantee

$$C_{k,\gamma} - \frac{c_{k,\gamma}}{A} \geq \frac{C_{k,\gamma}}{2},$$

we get a constant $m_{k,\gamma}$, depending only on k and γ such that

$$m_{k,\gamma}|L_j|^{-1/2} \leq |a_{n_j}(\phi)|, \qquad j = 0, \dots, \ell - 1. \tag{6.18}$$

Next, we estimate $\int_{R_j} |g_{n_j}(t)|\,\mathrm{d}t$ from below. First, employ Proposition 3.3, property (6) of Lemma 6.2 and the k-regularity of the point sequence (t_n) to get

$$\int_{R_j} |g_{n_j}(t)|\,\mathrm{d}t \gtrsim_{k,\gamma} |R_j||w_{i_j}|,$$

where w_{i_j} corresponds to the partition $\mathcal{T}_{n_j}$. By definition of w_{i_j},

$$\int_{R_j} |g_{n_j}(t)|\,\mathrm{d}t \gtrsim_{k,\gamma} |R_j||\alpha_{i_j}||b_{i_j,i_j}|.$$

By arguments similar as above, $|\alpha_{i_j}|$ is bounded from below by a constant only depending on k and γ, and $|b_{i_j,i_j}| \gtrsim_k |D^{(k)}_{n_j,i_j}|^{-1}$. Since by k-regularity, $|R_j| \sim_{k,\gamma} |D^{(k)}_{n_j,i_j}|$, we finally get

$$\int_{R_j} |g_{n_j}(t)|\,\mathrm{d}t \gtrsim_{k,\gamma} 1,$$

which means for f_{n_j} that

$$\int_{R_j} |f_{n_j}(t)|\,\mathrm{d}t \gtrsim_{k,\gamma} |J_{n_j}|^{1/2} \gtrsim_{k,\gamma} |L_j|^{1/2}.$$

Combining this last estimate with (6.18) and (1) of Lemma 6.2,

$$\int_0^1 \sup_n |a_n(\phi) f_n(t)|\,\mathrm{d}t \geq \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \int_{R_j} |a_{n_j}(\phi) f_{n_j}(t)|\,\mathrm{d}t \gtrsim_{k,\gamma} \ell.$$

This construction applies to every positive integer ℓ, proving the assertion of the proposition for $|\Lambda_0| > 0$.

The case $|\Lambda_0| = 0$ proceeds similarly, with the difference that the atom ϕ is defined as centered at the point τ_{n_0,i_0-1} and the length of the support is sufficiently small, depending on ℓ and $|L_0|$. □

With Proposition 6.1 and the results of Section 5, the proof of Theorem 2.4 follows now the same line of arguments as the proof of Theorem 2.2 in [15], but we present it here for the sake of the completeness.

Proof of Theorem 2.4. We start by proving the unconditional basis property of $(f_n) = (f_n^{(k)})$ assuming the $(k-1)$-regularity of (t_n). If (t_n) is $(k-1)$-regular, it is not difficult to check that it is also k-regular. As a consequence, Theorem 2.3 implies that (f_n) is a basis in H^1. Let $f \in H^1$ with $f = \sum a_n f_n$

and $\varepsilon \in \{-1,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$. We need to prove convergence of the series $\sum \varepsilon_n a_n f_n$ in H^1. Let $m_1 \le m_2$, then

$$\Big\| \sum_{n=m_1}^{m_2} \varepsilon_n a_n f_n \Big\|_{H^1} \lesssim_{k,\gamma} \Big\| S\Big(\sum_{n=m_1}^{m_2} \varepsilon_n a_n f_n \Big) \Big\|_1 \lesssim_k \Big\| P\Big(\sum_{n=m_1}^{m_2} \varepsilon_n a_n f_n \Big) \Big\|_1$$
$$= \Big\| P\Big(\sum_{n=m_1}^{m_2} a_n f_n \Big) \Big\|_1 \lesssim_{k,\gamma} \Big\| \sum_{n=m_1}^{m_2} a_n f_n \Big\|_{H^1}$$

where we used Proposition 5.4, Proposition 5.2 and Proposition 5.3, respectively (cf. also the picture on page 12). So, since $\sum a_n f_n$ converges in H^1, so does $f_\varepsilon := \sum \varepsilon_n a_n f_n$ and the same calculation as above shows

$$\|f_\varepsilon\|_{H^1} \lesssim_{k,\gamma} \|f\|_{H^1}.$$

This implies that (f_n) is an unconditional basis in H^1.

We now prove the converse, i.e., that (f_n) being an unconditional basis in H^1 implies the $(k-1)$-regularity condition. First, if (t_n) does not satisfy the k-regularity condition, (f_n) is not a basis in H^1 by Theorem 2.3. Thus, it remains to consider the case when (t_n) satisfies the k-regularity condition, but not the $(k-1)$-regularity condition. By Theorem 2.3 again, (f_n) is then a basis in H^1. Suppose that (f_n) is an unconditional basis in H^1. Then, for $f = \sum a_n f_n$ and $\varepsilon \in \{-1,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$, the function $f_\varepsilon := \sum \varepsilon_n a_n f_n$ is also in H^1. Since $\|\cdot\|_1 \le \|\cdot\|_{H^1}$, the series $\sum a_n f_n$ also converges unconditionally in L^1, and thus Proposition 5.1 (i.e., Khinchin's inequality) implies

$$\|Pf\|_1 \lesssim \sup_\varepsilon \|f_\varepsilon\|_1 \le \sup_\varepsilon \|f_\varepsilon\|_{H^1} \lesssim \|f\|_{H^1},$$

which is impossible due to Proposition 6.1, even for atoms. This concludes the proof of Theorem 2.4. □

As an immediate consequence of Theorem 2.4, a fifth equivalent condition to (A)-(D) is the unconditional convergence of $\sum_n a_n f_n$ in H^1:

Corollary 6.3. *Let (t_n) be a k-admissible and $(k-1)$-regular sequence of points, with (f_n) – the corresponding orthonormal spline system of order k. Let (a_n) be a sequence of coefficients. Then conditions (A) – (D) from Section 5 are equivalent.*

Moreover, they are equivalent to the following

(E) *The series $\sum_n a_n f_n$ converges unconditionally in H^1.*

In addition, for $f \in H^1$, $f = \sum_n a_n f_n$ we have

$$\|f\|_{H^1} \sim \|Sf\|_1 \sim \|Pf\|_1 \sim \sup_{\varepsilon \in \{-1,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}} \|\sum_n \varepsilon_n a_n f_n\|_1,$$

with the implied constants depending only on k and the parameter of $(k-1)$-regularity of the sequence (t_n).

Acknowledgments. A. Kamont is supported by Polish MNiSW grant N N201 607840 and M. Passenbrunner is supported by the Austrian Science Fund, FWF project P 23987-N18. Part of this work was done while A. Kamont was visiting the Department of Analysis, J. Kepler University Linz in November 2013. This stay in Linz was supported by FWF project P 23987-N18. G. Gevorkyan and K. Keryan were supported by SCS RA grant 13-1A006.

References

[1] S.-Y. A. Chang and Z. Ciesielski. Spline characterizations of H^1. *Studia Math.*, 75:183 – 192, 1983.

[2] Z. Ciesielski. Properties of the orthonormal Franklin system. *Studia Math.*, 23:141–157, 1963.

[3] Z. Ciesielski. Properties of the orthonormal Franklin system. II. *Studia Math.*, 27:289–323, 1966.

[4] Z. Ciesielski. Orthogonal projections onto spline spaces with arbitrary knots. In *Function spaces (Poznań, 1998)*, volume 213 of *Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math.*, pages 133–140. Dekker, New York, 2000.

[5] Z. Ciesielski and A. Kamont. Projections onto piecewise linear functions. *Funct. Approx. Comment. Math.*, 25:129–143, 1997. Dedicated to Roman Taberski on the occasion of his 70th birthday.

[6] R. R. Coifman and G. Weiss. Extensions of Hardy spaces and their use in analysis. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 83:569–645, 1977.

[7] C. de Boor. On the convergence of odd-degree spline interpolation. *J. Approximation Theory*, 1:452–463, 1968.

[8] C. de Boor. The quasi-interpolant as a tool in elementary polynomial spline theory. In *Approximation theory (Proc. Internat. Sympos., Univ. Texas, Austin, Tex., 1973)*, pages 269–276. Academic Press, New York, 1973.

[9] C. de Boor. On a max-norm bound for the least-squares spline approximant. In *Approximation and function spaces (Gdańsk, 1979)*, pages 163–175. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1981.

[10] R. A. DeVore and G. G. Lorentz. *Constructive approximation*, volume 303 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1993.

[11] J. Domsta. A theorem on B-splines. *Studia Math.*, 41:291–314, 1972.

[12] G. G. Gevorkyan. Some theorems on unconditional convergence and the majorant of Franklin series and their application to ReH^p. *Trudy Mat. Inst. Steklova*, 190:49 – 74, 1989.

[13] G. G. Gevorkyan and A. Kamont. On general Franklin systems. *Dissertationes Math. (Rozprawy Mat.)*, 374:59, 1998.

[14] G. G. Gevorkyan and A. Kamont. Unconditionality of general Franklin systems in $L^p[0,1], 1 < p < \infty$. *Studia Math.*, 164(2):161–204, 2004.

[15] G. G. Gevorkyan and A. Kamont. General Franklin systems as bases in $H^1[0,1]$. *Studia Math.*, 167(3):259–292, 2005.

[16] G. G. Gevorkyan and A. Kamont. Orthonormal spline systems with arbitrary knots as bases in $H_1[0,1]$. *East J. Approx.*, 14(2):161–182, 2008.

[17] G. G. Gevorkyan and A. A. Sahakian. Unconditional basis property of general Franklin systems. *Izv. Nats. Akad. Nauk Armenii Mat.*, 35(4):7–25 (2001), 2000.

[18] S. Karlin. *Total positivity. Vol. I.* Stanford University Press, Stanford, Calif, 1968.

[19] B. S. Kashin and A. A. Saakyan. *Orthogonal series*, volume 75 of *Translations of Mathematical Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1989. Translated from the Russian by Ralph P. Boas, Translation edited by Ben Silver.

[20] M. Passenbrunner. Unconditionality of orthogonal spline systems in L^p. *Studia Math.*, 222(1):51–86, 2014.
[21] M. Passenbrunner and A. Shadrin. On almost everywhere convergence of orthogonal spline projections with arbitrary knots. *Journal of Approximation Theory*, 180:77–89, 2014.
[22] A. Shadrin. The L_∞-norm of the L_2-spline projector is bounded independently of the knot sequence: a proof of de Boor's conjecture. *Acta Math.*, 187(1):59–137, 2001.
[23] P. Sjölin and J.O. Strömberg. Basis properties of Hardy spaces. *Ark. Mat.*, 21:111 – 125, 1983.
[24] M. v. Golitschek. On the L^∞-norm of the orthogonal projector onto splines. a short proof of a. shadrin's theorem. *Journal of Approximation Theory*, 181:30 – 42, 2014.

Yerevan State University, Alex Manoukian 1, Yerevan, Armenia
E-mail address: ggg@ysu.am

Institute of Mathematics of the Polish Academy of Sciences, ul. Wita Stwosza 57, 80-952 Gdańsk, Poland
E-mail address: A.Kamont@impan.gda.pl

Yerevan State University, Alex Manoukian 1, Yerevan, Armenia
E-mail address: karenkeryan@ysu.am

Institute of Analysis, Johannes Kepler University Linz, Austria, 4040 Linz, Altenberger Strasse 69
E-mail address: markus.passenbrunner@jku.at